<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Alisonrm.00@gmail.com">Alisonrm.00@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/13/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>Impact of industrial blight on tax base. As noted, “In terms of land use, the County’s primary industrial areas include the Indiana Enterprise Center, Southwest South Bend, and the South Bend International Airport (SBN) vicinity (e.g. Airport Industrial Park, Ameriplex, Blackthorn Corporate Park, SBN Freight &amp; Logistics Park, and the US 31 Industrial Corridor). Other clusters of industrial areas are present in Mishawaka, Walkerton, and far northeast St. Joseph County. These industrial areas developed naturally due their access to highway, rail, and air transportation assets and utility systems.”. Why, if developments occur naturally, are County &amp; City funds required to subsidize new greenfield development while brownfields well-served by road/rail networks are also subsidized by taxpayers, in that they are kept clean &amp; safe, &amp; ultimately demolished, at public expense?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Alisonrm.00@gmail.com">Alisonrm.00@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/13/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Why are so many industrial-zones areas in SB color-coded gray (other) instead of dark blue (industrial)? Is it to make it seem as if there’s less industrial opportunity in the county to justify the expense on greenfield development vs. well-organized brownfield redevelopment?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Alisonrm.00@gmail.com">Alisonrm.00@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/13/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>Growth is a stupid goal. Have you seen the stock market lately? Did that growth generate commensurate growth in quality of life? Let’s aim for sustainability instead. In other words, let’s avoid 30 years of dilapidated industrial buildings &amp; abandoned infrastructure where a large company maybe had 40 years of strong growth before collapsing - by making the new companies rebuild off of the existing infrastructure systems.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Alisonrm.00@gmail.com">Alisonrm.00@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/13/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>I’m upset that wastewater treatment is given such a light review. Aside from the expense of building &amp; maintaining the network, the actual treatment of industrial wastewater can be a huge expense. SB’s wastewater system is already obsolete &amp; substantially out of compliance with EPA regulations designed to keep waterways relatively clean. Adding another major industrial customer to that system could be a nightmare. For example, maintaining compliance for something as agricultural as a concentrated juice canning facility can mean managing die-offs of the “good” bacteria at the plant due to fluctuations in wastewater based on production cycles and equipment cleaning procedures. It can also mean managing toxic gas in manholes and brutally acidic effluent that reduces the life of sewer pipes by many decades. I truly hope that I won’t be asked to subsidize that where once there was farmland, be it directly through public money or higher residential sewer rates or indirectly because the water I’d like to swim in is ruined because the local sewage treatment plant continues to violate EPA standards, because the new industrial customer certainly won’t pay high enough utility rates to offset the difficulty of managing industrial waste while also bringing the system into compliance.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Alisonrm.00@gmail.com">Alisonrm.00@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/13/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>No. They might be fine for SW South Bend’s underutilized and vacant industrial &amp; commercial areas. Why consider business uses on green fields when there are ample empty brownfield &amp; underutilized industrial areas already well-served by road, rail, sewer, and water networks? I also find the use of branding like this to be outside of what my tax dollars should be supporting.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Alisonrm.00@gmail.com">Alisonrm.00@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/13/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>Not doing greenfield development. Let’s not repeat the mistakes of FoxConn. When there’s existing infrastructure, it should be utilized first.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
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<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
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<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
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<td>------------------------------</td>
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<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:andrewandrebekah@comast.net">andrewandrebekah@comast.net</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>I take exception to the use of the word &quot;ecosystem&quot; to describe these 3 pillars. An ecosystem is generally (and most properly) understood to mean, &quot;the complex of living organisms, their physical environment, and their interrelationships in that space.&quot; Although I understand that the term has been &quot;borrowed&quot; for use in business, development, and other areas of practice I believe that an alternative term would be more appropriate (perhaps it could be described as &quot;the IEC network&quot; or some other more obviously non-biological entity.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:andrewandrebekah@comast.net">andrewandrebekah@comast.net</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>The foundational principles and intended targets of the land conservation measures that are included in this chapter are unclear. Did the planning team consider biodiversity, rare species, rare ecotypes, etc as targets for conservation and as consistent with sound conservation planning principles? Please consider the abundant guidance on &quot;greenprinting&quot; as developed by The Nature Conservancy and other conservation professionals in designing the &quot;conservation buffers&quot; (<a href="https://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationPractices/PeopleConservation/greenprints/Pages/Learn-About-Greenprints.aspx">https://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationPractices/PeopleConservation/greenprints/Pages/Learn-About-Greenprints.aspx</a>). In fact, the planning team ought to consider biodiversity and ecotype conservation as a first principle, not as a &quot;buffer&quot; to industrial development. The scale of this development planning is not consistent with conservation principles outlined in the 2002 St Joseph County Comprehensive Plan. That 2002 Plan would be a helpful starting point for directing the scope and placement of any development in this part of the county. Which is to say, &quot;not at the proposed scale.&quot;</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:andrewandrebekah@comast.net">andrewandrebekah@comast.net</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>Furthermore, regarding wetlands - wetland restoration, including compensatory mitigation (i.e. creating a new human-made wetland to replace a lost natural wetland), leads to the creation of wetlands that are not ecologically equivalent to naturally occurring wetlands. In other words, the reproduction is not as good as the original. Peer-reviewed science shows that even after 100 years, biodiversity remains lower in created compared to naturally occurring wetlands (by about 25% on average) and other ecosystem services like nutrient storage are also lower. Wetland conservation, rather than restoration, should be a core focus of the IEC plan.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:andrewandrebekah@comast.net">andrewandrebekah@comast.net</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Regarding water quality - The INDOT procedural manual includes guidance for common environmental considerations. The manual notes (p. 158) “The perimeter of the St. Joseph Aquifer location map is to be used for general guidance purposes only. The exact boundaries of this vulnerable source of drinking water have not been determined with precise accuracy. Projects located close to, but just outside of the designated perimeter of the St. Joseph Aquifer, particularly ones involving subsurface drainage structures, deep excavation or retention/detention basins should be coordinated with the EPA.” To what extent has the IEC planning team coordinated this development with EPA? Have all appropriate and legally required planning measures been followed?</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
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<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:andrewandrebekah@comast.net">andrewandrebekah@comast.net</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>Farmland is important for the thriving of rural communities, food systems and a resilient environment. In accordance with the Saint Joseph County Comprehensive Plan (2002) new development in areas of high agricultural importance should be minimized (page Chapter 5, 5-2). I affirm that agricultural areas also have economic importance for the community and the State. (page Chapter 5, 5-2). Furthermore, the IEC development (as proposed) contradicts the County Comprehensive Plan’s finding that “The floodplain and wet soil conditions in the western part of the County preclude heavy development” (Chapter 3, 3-9).</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Andyoldham5@gmail.com">Andyoldham5@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>nobody from new Carlisle wants the iec here. Your website won’t even let me see this plan all I can see is the comments section.</td>
<td>Appendicies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net">anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>When you focus on one tool in your tool box, a precious, useful, long relied upon tool, lets say a hammer, everything begins to look like a nail. Just because industrial development has in the past brought economic prosperity to every corner of the globe for decades and decades does not mean that that is the appropriate direction to go in at this crucial point in time. There are economic opportunities in organic food production and we clearly have exactly the resources to support such development. Huge companies such as General Mills (where your breakfast cereals come from), Costco and Whole Foods are currently looking for farmers to partner with. They are offering loans and grants to farmers to help make the transition from conventional to organic farming practices (which are costly and take up to 3 years or more to complete). We are sitting on a potential gold mine.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
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<td>--------------------------</td>
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<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net">anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Given that this area has access to transportation, it could easily support an increase in agriculture such as organic food production. With multiple markets not far away (think Chicago) and the possibility of shipment either by rail or truck, even perishable produce could be part of the plan. Advanced manufacturing, while possible, could bring such potential disruption to the community, as well as the possible permanent spoiling of the resources that currently exist, it seems not likely to achieve the intended goals here.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net">anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Industry comes and goes. When it goes, it leaves unusable, ugly areas that are depressing to be around and often are sites that we later learn are filled with environmental toxins. Farming, however, will remain necessary as long as humans need to eat. Why not put our investment, our tax dollars and development talent into a sure thing?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net">anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>The County should be trying to attract jobs to the area that do not require high levels of education as we have a large population of young people without advanced degrees who need good paying steady jobs. Also the County should be looking for jobs that will be long lasting, ie jobs that are not on the list to be automated or outsourced any time in the foreseeable long term. Jobs that do not depend on the whims of industry looking for cheaper labor. Jobs that are necessary no matter the state of the economy or current political trends. Agricultural jobs are one type of job that could fit these parameters. Currently there is a shortage of organic farms and an ever increasing demand for organic food products. Organic farms are much more labor intensive due to the types of agricultural methods used, and thus could provide many more jobs than currently exist on the farms in New Carlisle.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
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<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net">anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>The plan does not mention the competitive advantage that the existing farmland has in the area if it were further developed for organic agriculture. Currently there is a great shortage of organic farms in the US and an ever growing demand for organic food products. Large companies such as General Mills and Costco are partnering with small farms to fill this need. This is an area that would be worth looking into.</td>
<td>While it is obviously true that the area has resources that could support an industrial site of this size, is this really the best use of these resources? Just because these resources exist (big air, big land and big water I believe they have been referred to) does it make it wise to use them in this way? Given the climate change issues we are already experiencing, I think organic farming using regenerative agricultural methods would be an ideal way to kill the proverbial 2 birds with 1 stone, ie bringing permanent, sustainable new jobs to the area (as organic farming is far more labor intensive than conventional farming) and increasing the carbon sequestering capacity of the land which in turn decreases CO2 in the air, thus reversing the factors that are causing the climate crisis.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net">anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>One cannot conserve land by paving it over. One cannot conserve fresh water by placing a factory on top of a shallow aquifer. There is nothing green about putting a megaindustrial site in the middle of a farming community. These are buzzwords being used in the hopes of making the plan more palatable to the citizens of this area.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net">anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>It is simple- develop and invest in what you already have in ways that ensure future economic growth and that do not risk the loss or degradation of the very resources you have. Look for ways to invest in the land (eg organic farming, regenerative agriculture), not pave it over.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net">anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
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<td>------------------------------</td>
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<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net">anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>This being 2020 and not 1980, a truly appropriate (for the challenges of the times we live in) vision for the New Carlisle area would be to put to maximum use its already existing resources, ie fertile farmland fed by an unpolluted aquifer, not planning to pave over thousands of acres of soil and potentially pollute the air and water for the citizens that live there.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net">anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>When I think about the IEC being the 9th largest industrial megaplex in the country, it is with a sense of dread and profound disbelief. The first Earth Day was 50 years ago this past week. People took to the streets and demanded that our government start paying attention to the science that was already warning of grave consequences if we continued our mad rush to use all available resources in pursuit of the almighty dollar. Our government responded with the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act and under Richard Nixon’s administration, the EPA was born. So here we are 50 years later. Can we really be seriously considering the IEC as a solution to our economic stagnation problem? How about this: imagine St Joseph County in 10 years being the 9th largest organic farming region in the country, in addition to housing the first and largest research and development center for regenerative agriculture, and soil rebuilding farming practices. Imagine all of us working toward that goal. If we can imagine it, we can do it.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net">anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>Concise or not, the proposed 7,200 acres exceeds the 2002 County Land Use Plan which provided for only 2,000 acres to be parceled out for industrial use.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net">anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>Given that the existing community is agricultural based, I see no evidence</td>
<td>Given that the existing community is agricultural based, I see no evidence that the proposed industrial development will do anything to improve the quality of life for the residents of New Carlisle. Industry means more traffic, thus more noise and air pollution and of course you are running the risk of polluting the aquifer. Too many risks to take for a few hundred new jobs.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net">anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various</td>
<td>Feedback was not gathered from anyone that is a true stakeholder ie the people that live and work in New Carlisle, until the County Council began holding meetings and a local advocacy group alerted the public that this was going on. And by the time any of us knew about it, already millions of dollars of our taxpayer money had been spent. A shameful waste and an inexcusable disregard for the citizens supposedly represented by those who have concocted this whole &quot;plan&quot;.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net">anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>This plan is straight out of a Joni Mitchell song- &quot;Pave paradise and put up a parking lot&quot;. I understand that everyone involved in the planning is mostly well meaning but the idea itself, the very idea itself is just plain outdated. This is 2020. The climate crisis is upon us and we have maybe 10 years to make enough changes in how we do business to avoid catastrophe. We do not need more heavy industry. We need more, not less, farmland, more regenerative agricultural practices, more trees, etc etc. I understand the desire to improve economic opportunity in this area but there just has to be a better way than this.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>------------------------------</td>
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<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net">anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>The entire question of land use must be brought to the public, front and center. What do we, as the taxpaying citizens of this county want to do to promote economic growth? in the year 2020, with the effects of climate change bearing down on us, with more and more jobs being automated, what do we, as citizens of this county think would be a wise course of action. We are the ones who have to breathe the air and listen to the sounds of whatever businesses are around us. We are the ones who drink the water and whose children drink the water. We are the ones who should have the primary say in this matter. We have the right to determine what is done with the big air, the big sky and the big land that we live on</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net">anne_thacker@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>To reduce public Concern / Clarity about the development within the IEC, the County must simply go back to the drawing board. It is abundantly clear after a number of Council meetings that allowed for public comment, as well as numerous letters to the editors of the South Bend Tribune, along with a survey of New Carlisle residents who whose land would be directly affected by the proposed development, that this is just not what the residents want for their community.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:annenapoli@icloud.com">annenapoli@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>No. Yes, there are other principles that need to be further considered. This is prime farmland in a long-standing farming community. There are many underdeveloped pieces of property in Northwest Indiana that are not farmland that is needed, and will increasingly be needed as the population in the US and the world continues to grow. Other land with buildings that are not in use, underutilized, or derelict should be considered.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
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<td>Question</td>
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<td>Chapter</td>
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<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:annenapoli@icloud.com">annenapoli@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>Sure. However, this online forum for comment is not enough. Have a series of open meetings (after coronavirus dies down, or a Televised forum that is well publicized and local people can phone in/vote) with the town.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:annenapoli@icloud.com">annenapoli@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>Yes, there are. The town/local residents should get to vote to support or veto the project and/or portions of it. It could, and will likely drastically change the community.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:askmykol@att.net">askmykol@att.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>It is clearly apparent that this is a self-serving statement, written in legalese, making it easy to mask everything from the public - hidden away on the internet away from public view. This statement does not consider repurposing existing blighted commercial land in need of redevelopment closer to the city, where workers could easily access jobs by bus.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:askmykol@att.net">askmykol@att.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>If you want the public to be able to respond to your draft, why would you write it in legal wording, making it hard for most people to understand what you are doing? Your questions are designed to herd your answers to only what you want, making it look like everyone approves of your proposal, as if it’s a done deal. Shame on you!</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:askmykol@att.net">askmykol@att.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Before the virus, we were at the lowest unemployment in history. If you want to attract new people to St. Joseph County, concentrate on making it a safe place to live. With the best roads in the state and top-rated schools, you will not have a problem attracting business and industry. Your problem is you have it all backwards, thinking the tail wags the dog! Businesses don’t want to relocate in a blighted, poorly-run county. Look at the conditions of our roads. Do you think companies want to run their trucks on crumbling roads like we find in St. Joseph county?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:askmykol@att.net">askmykol@att.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>It worries me when the proposal states that the IEC is the 9th largest industrial development in the United States even before it exists. This project should be stopped. before it bankrupts St. Joseph County for the next twenty years, like the Elwood, Illinois industrial complex bankrupted the town of Elwood.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:askmykol@att.net">askmykol@att.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>The pillars do not explain how the roads suddenly appear to support all three. TIF funds only go so far and until businesses commit to building, current taxpayers will be forced to burden the expense, not only today, but the next 20-40 years, like what happened in Elwood, Illinois. Their roads are crumbling faster than they can be repaired. I do not think St. Joseph County can carry this burden. The best use for this area would be farming only.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:askmykol@att.net">askmykol@att.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have you asked each individual land owner in the targeted area and surrounding 5-10 mile radius how they feel about the plan? You really need to get concrete numbers as to how they would vote on this project. Their lives will greatly be affected by this and they should have a vote on this project and not the Redevelopment Board that does not live next door to this nightmare of a plan. How has a study been done on existing animal habitats? Which animals will be affected by this land transformation?</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:askmykol@att.net">askmykol@att.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area?</td>
<td>Outside of clean air and peaceful surroundings of the area - No, wait. You are proposing to destroy those, sorry. You can’t use those once you have brought in diesel semi trucks non-stop.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:askmykol@att.net">askmykol@att.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Your Direct Feedback uses all the great things New Carlisle has, a small community, peaceful setting, clean and abundant water supply, as a selling point for this project. In reality, your building this vast industrial megaplex uses up a once plentiful clean water supply, brings in large numbers of people to this area and destroys the environment and existing New Carlisle identity.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:askmykol@att.net">askmykol@att.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>We were told when the shredder plant cam in, they would hold high standards, respecting the environment and neighborhoods. After numerous explosions and fires from the shredder plant and hazardous material falling out of the trucks that leave this plant, citizens wonder where have those high standards gone? If you can’t keep the shredder plant safe, who are we expected to believe anything you say now? Keeping the targeted area farmland only would maintain the perfect characteristics of the existing area.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:askmykol@att.net">askmykol@att.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>Your plan wants to bring more workers to St. Joseph County, but makes it an extreme hardship for the workers most in need of employment. The project area is so far out of the city and will eliminate lower-income workers access by bus. You fail to consider farming as a great industry suitable for this area. That would not destroy our environment. The excessive asphalt that would be part of the IEC would heat up the area and contribute to global warming.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:askmykol@att.net">askmykol@att.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>The boundaries do not specify surrounding major roads well to clearly inform people of which lands will be taken, or why this area was singled out over any other. This designation does not state why it ignored the early 2000's plan and why it has to take this land and more.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:askmykol@att.net">askmykol@att.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>This Direct Feedback uses a three circle graph showing agriculture as an equal part, but the agriculture part keeps getting pushed out, as the IEC gobbles up land like an uncontrollable monster never having enough acreage.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:askmykol@att.net">askmykol@att.net</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>When did St. Joseph County decide it is in the business of taking over land from the people? This is not needed. Out county leadership should try doing the job they were originally set up to do, fixing our streets, law enforcement, proper and efficient leaf pick-up. Once you can perfect these jobs, you will have people wanting to move back here.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>As far as being a transportation hub, specifically the 11 hour truckers' limits, this is not an issue since the current estimates are that 3.5 million truckers will lose their jobs to automation. Will the businesses lower their prices and increase wages since transportation will be cheaper?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>I live near the shredder - now in its third ownership. As new owners take over operations the initial owners' commitments to the community disappear. If you require any more information on this, please send me an email for more information.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>The desired outcomes appear to be somewhat one sided. The community's desired outcomes were not specifically addressed since many or most of us live here because our desired outcomes are already being met. This will most probably be reiterated throughout people's comments but the principles of transparency have not been addressed to the Locals. I for one, have lived in the area for 45 years, and except for a couple of community meetings and a County Council meeting know nothing about the history of the project nor how expansive it has become as well as the potentially increase of that expanse.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>I understand the boundaries listed in the statement, but living within the boundaries do not know anything about the future of my neighbors and my homes. There have been twenty years or more of studies, but they cannot tell us about our potential future.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>The word &quot;will&quot; was used throughout the vision. This is a definitive word that indicates promise, and only used when the outcome is absolute.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Unless industries are brought in thoughtfully using stockholders as the last priority, we should stick to agriculture.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>To sustain our ground water and if I sell my property I am required to install a $15000 septic mound system. My wife and I use the facilities once a day each. If we live another 20 years, which is past life expectancy, that is over a dollar a poop. There is a sewer line 0.15 miles to the north put in for the industrial area that I could hook into. Since this is one of the environmental infrastructures why cannot I hook into it? Is this part of the plan? By the way our dog uses his facilities for free.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>Since there is not much understanding of what industries could move in you have to look at what we have. IN TEK has been a a good addition to the area. They produce necessary products and up to now pay better than most.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>Smith cements appear to be doing well, but the roads are showing wear, could be from the trucks.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>Scott Brass is out of business and up for sale. I have heard that Edcoat did not live up to its initial employment promises. The Shredder employs under paid workers and is a loud industry, and does shake the foundation of my house (no noticeable damage that I can attribute to it, yet). The sound barrier has not been erected and their pond is contaminated (former employee's comment). These businesses should be investigated before they become existing conditions.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>We have a very good school system, compared to the rest of the state. Our Fire department is well trained and sufficient for our current needs.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Having worked at Carborundum/Unifrax for 45 years, I know that the plant was in operation since before 1976. (1968 was when it was built). I also know we do not have 160 employees. Although I do not know the other industries in the area as well, since your facts are not entirely correct, there is some trepidation as to how accurate your statistics are presented.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Currently the company I work for that was listed in the favorable industries still uses 1975 technology in many of its product lines and uses late 1980’s computer technology. These pillars do not address industrial reality where the priorities are costs.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Industries priorities are stock holders, company, customers, and community/people. The sustainable priority list is company, customer, community/people, and stock holders. Any business brought in using the first list. The plan will not work for communities and people if the second priority list is not used.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Right now the agriculture pillar works. When they use the newer technology they can produce more, They can also transport their product using our infrastructure.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>The plan uses the terms can, should, and could unless industry is mentioned, then the term is will. Unless there is more concrete evidence the plan as written will be carried out the question is moot.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>I did not see mention of our unique aquifers and the underground river that runs through the area. These are very well suited for sustainable agriculture. Concrete and asphalt may be a hinderance to that unique sustainability.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>Due diligence is an accounting term that really has no meaning. We have been developing the area on a daily basis for centuries. A huge boost like this can only disrupt natural growth. The County has already forfeited any implementation by asking not only so late but making it so hard to access.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>On the eastern side of the County industries would include help to the RV industry. The west side could use agricultural type industries such as seed farms, tractor supplies and fertilizer outlets.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>My wife, neighbors and myself went to two of the meetings, The first was at the local Fire Department where we could not hear any of the oration because of traffic. The second was just as uninformed as the speaker spoke continually, but said nothing. For me there was no point in wasting time going to more meetings.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:b10d2allen@yahoo.com">b10d2allen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>Areas improve on their own timetables that keep all aspects in mind. Having a quickely constucted complex where it is possible that the money made in the area will not remain in the area is not always the bes idea. That is not sustainable and is done unnaturally. People have to rely on local government because they know our interests and goals better than larger governments. We vote for people we believe in. When there are integrity issues, either real or imagined, there really is no place to go. What makes us different from other animals is our essence is based on a balance between mind body, and spirit. Money is not included in the equation. Please do as well as you can, that is all we can ask.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bdemeyer@aol.com">bdemeyer@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Don't see how farmland is going to be preserved by removing that much from production. Most of Red Hen Turf Farm is not in IEC area. Gavilon will not be as productive in earnings with farmland being removed from production. Can't have it both ways!</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bdemeyer@aol.com">bdemeyer@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>No definite plan on how to keep the additional semi traffic out of downtown New Carlisle. Plan talks about possibilities - major financial Concern / Claritys and how feasible are they? When a traffic light at State Road 2 and Larrison Blvd. can't be installed for safety because would slow down truckers, why should we believe there will be follow-thru on eliminating trucking going thru downtown? Total lack of trust on part of Mr. Shalliol and the County at this point because of rubber stamping whatever he says.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bdemeyer@aol.com">bdemeyer@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>My personal feeling is saying promoting Agribusiness in the iEC area is to try and pacify residents and those Concern / Clarityed with removing productive farmland. Agribusiness already exists and you are trying to remove it. Just what agribusiness has shown interest into moving into this area?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bdemeyer@aol.com">bdemeyer@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>Until and IF there is definite interest in land for a business/industry in this IEC area, do NOT develop it. When Project Future was formed and I/N Tek was going to be built, the County did not buy up the land first and then sell it to I/N Tek. Our tax dollars should not be used to buy up land for future development with the idea of prospering. We sold land for I/n Kote and know how it can be handled with transparency and respect for the sellers.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bdemeyer@aol.com">bdemeyer@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>When the County can't hold a business, the Scrapping Company, to their initial agreement to receive abatement, etc. why should we trust the County to protect our environment, air quality, aquifer, etc. with any other industry? Shredder has another new owner in the last month - does that mean that can be open whenever they want, still don't have to build the fencing, keep the road clear for firetrucks to get thru for their many fires? Most people don't even feel safe driving down Smilax because of the flat tires from all the metal dropped on the roadway. Take care of existing major issues in this area, and show us real numbers as to actual businesses interested in the area, number of jobs it will create, how environmentally safe they are.............then we would feel you are listening to our Concern / Claritys about now and future generation.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bdemeyer@aol.com">bdemeyer@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>The aquafier has been studied, but when Mr. Shalliol states at a public county meeting that he doesn't understand the report - a serious condition to our future and should NOT be glossed over as insignificant. Same issue with moving the ditch.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:becky@justgoods.net">becky@justgoods.net</a></td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>This chapter only makes sense as a sales pitch to outside industry. How you can protect the agricultural lands and the local communities while using up agricultural land and bringing in more noise and traffic laden industrial facilities? We need an entirely different approach to development. This one is outdated. We need to be looking to our own communities and asking what they need and how they can supply it themselves. Instead, Mr. Schalliol proposes that we compete with other communities to bring in polluters and industrialists who no longer create jobs with benefits and long term prospects. They seek to use up our resources to enrich themselves. Why give them our rich land and water, and allow them to degrade our small communities?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:becky@justgoods.net">becky@justgoods.net</a></td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>How do we know that these principles will be followed in the project? I have been following this project since I first learned of it two years ago. To date, the Vision and Principles do not match up with the behavior of the Economic Development Director, nor with the actual proposal.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:becky@justgoods.net">becky@justgoods.net</a></td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>No. As you mention, “Given the large remaining land mass and the importance of agriculture in the area, this is also highlighted as a resource and continuing tradition for the area. The objective is to establish a flexible and adaptable approach that can respond to land use decisions by the various landowners within the IEC, allowing them to optimize their assets with minimal disruption to existing businesses and residents.” Why would you create a patchwork of industry and agriculture? You are inviting endless feuds because industry and residential/agricultural uses will be incompatible on so many occasions.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:becky@justgoods.net">becky@justgoods.net</a></td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>Let’s not think about how to make our economy bigger, and how to make bigger profits for corporations with the hope that they will &quot;provide&quot; us with jobs. Let's think about how to serve one another through fair relationships where our existing communities can thrive. Let's &quot;develop&quot; education. Let's support micro developers who are making our neighborhoods strong. Let’s ensure life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for ALL.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:becky@justgoods.net">becky@justgoods.net</a></td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>What happens if we pave over this farmland, and want it back someday? We know how difficult it is to reclaim industrial brownfields for ANY use, nevermind for farming. Why would we propose this change in land use? Also, are your numbers on available water in the aquifer matched to the 22,000 acres under study, or the 7,200 proposed project area? They seem very large.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:becky@justgoods.net">becky@justgoods.net</a></td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>IF we think this is a good idea for our county, then, YES, we should do it while protecting the environment. However, I question whether we can do this at all while being protective of our natural resources, limiting noise pollution, avoiding unlined retention ponds near our aquifer, etc.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:becky@justgoods.net">becky@justgoods.net</a></td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>We should be providing incentives for sustainable and regenerative agriculture. We could be doing job training for restoring and maintaining existing infrastructure and historic buildings. We should have a green energy plan to create our own clean energy for use of our own population, with jobs provided locally.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:becky@justgoods.net">becky@justgoods.net</a></td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>Water protections.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:becky@justgoods.net">becky@justgoods.net</a></td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>No. Redo the 2002 plan with extensive public and stakeholder input before moving ahead with a project so misaligned with the existing plan.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:becky@justgoods.net">becky@justgoods.net</a></td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>Everything about this is problematic. This is not a project, it is a proposed project. Since it does not fit within the existing County Economic Development Plan, it should not even be considered until that 2002 plan is updated. According to the plan we have already developed the maximum allowable acres in this region.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:becky@justgoods.net">becky@justgoods.net</a></td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>Again, this proposed project needs to be put on hold. When the county initiates an update of the master economic development plan of 2002, they should invite stakeholders to be involved in every step of the process. PS &quot;Various&quot; here means 2 or 3. The only reason any public meetings were initiated is because citizens went to the press to show that this process was going on in secret.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:becky@justgoods.net">becky@justgoods.net</a></td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>Follow the 2002 plan. Keep industrial zones closer to existing ones around South Bend and Mishawaka.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:brodenjo7@gmail.com">brodenjo7@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>Nearly every single aspect of this Direct Feedback, as with most County economic planning endeavors, requires more public transparency, education, collaboration, and input. A full public planning process is warranted that equitably considers the pros and cons of this land use proposal versus other opportunities. As a whole, what has been proposed ignores smart growth principles, lacks a cooperative vision of growth with the COSB’s underutilized industrial areas, infrastructure, and workforce. Extend the process, the time for comment and let’s do this right. I’m sorry for the quick response, a pandemic has disrupted my life and that of so many others!</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>The appendices to which the Direct Feedback frequently refers are not included online. Chapter 1 suggests Appendices A-K begin on page 107. However, Chapter 5, titled Conclusion, ends on page 105.</td>
<td>Appendicies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>The opening sentence gives cause for pause, noting that after 40 years of existence and promotion, the IEC remains a national secret. Why disrupt the region with new infrastructure on such a large scale if the demand has not significantly materialized after 40 years?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>5/4/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Consider the size of the mega-complex. It is equivalent to the area of South Bend bounded by Cleveland Road, Bendix Ave., Western Ave., and Juniper Rd./Eddy St.! Those 7,200 acres are equivalent to ten square miles! The plan to build the 9th largest enterprise area in the country is akin to saying, “Let’s pave and build an area one fourth the size of City of South Bend and plop it onto high-quality farmland.”</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>5/5/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>That new infrastructure is at county taxpayer expense. Surely it will divert funding intended for converting brownspace elsewhere into useable property. And surely it will divert money from maintaining and repairing existing infrastructure. Add on the imminent financial burdens from coronavirus in a recession-like climate. This is likely not the time for county taxpayers to embrace expansive new investments/land grabs.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>5/6/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Is touted bike network predominantly a signed bike route on extant roads? I’m Concern / Clarityed some of the proposed amenities will get short shrift when it comes time to funding. A pedestrian tunnel sounds safe and appealing in a marketing plan, but it’s a big ticket item easily demoted on the funding priority list.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>Clearly much effort and money has been put into the plan, to the credit of its authors. However, the plan has a decided bias that markets the pleasantries of building a new economy and community. And it projects a self-assigned inevitability, as if implementation is requisite.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>The plan emphasizes the constraint on development as the default woe to correct, when it ought to emphasize the constraints that development puts on the existing space. The Direct Feedback is supportive of the environment in generalities. For example:</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>However, there is no specific action plan or oversight suggested. These generalities could be dismissed and the replies become: We considered, but…” “We deemed it not possible after all…” “We still think it’s a priority, just not met yet…”</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>When the Planning Area is predominantly agricultural with “limited development constraints,” one anticipates development will readily run rough-shod over valuable land that has few voices behind it. If environmental assets are a priority as stated, tell me in advance how they will preserved.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/28/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>Yes. An inaugural sky survey on April 9, 2018, quantified the level of light (<a href="https://www.nightwise.org/single-post/2018/04/11/Sky-Survey-Over-Fields-Sprouting-Industry">https://www.nightwise.org/single-post/2018/04/11/Sky-Survey-Over-Fields-Sprouting-Industry</a>) at multiple locations within three zones (see link for zone maps).</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/29/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>A second survey on June 5, 2018, (<a href="https://www.nightwise.org/single-post/2018/06/07/Results-of-Sky-Survey-Near-New-Carlisle">https://www.nightwise.org/single-post/2018/06/07/Results-of-Sky-Survey-Near-New-Carlisle</a>) yielded average SQM readings of 20.46 magnitudes per square arcseconds.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/30/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>This value from June 5 compares well with the average of 20.22 magnitudes per square arcsecond from the inaugural April 9 sky survey.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>5/1/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>The plan includes a positive note in that “I&amp;M’s Olive Solar Power Plant has 57,500 solar panels and covers 40-acres (Figure 3.15).” In the plan, is there any more emphasis on solar energy as opposed to Phase II of the St. Joseph Energy Center? Addressing our nation’s imminent need—to build abundant renewable energy capacity—should be enshrined in all future development.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>Yes, an asset not attributed to the region is its dark skies. If we are to recognize what is at risk of being lost, we must include the night sky. Two sky surveys that quantified the existing level of sky glow in the IEC region in April and June 2018 are detailed in Chapter 3 comments.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>As noted in Chapter 3 Question 1, the plan makes a nod toward environmental Concern / Claritys, but there is no action, oversight, or specifics about how developmental and environmental clashes would be reconciled. I expect money wins and nature loses.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>While I appreciate nods to environmental Concern / Claritys, I question whether SJC and its taxpayers are in a position to develop the 9th largest mega-industrial complex in the nation with requisite funding and zeal to protect the environment.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>If the IEC does proceed, a significant shortcoming of the plan is its lack of commitment to protecting the night environment, for the sake both of us humans and of the nocturnal kingdom. While evolution takes into account that half our lives are from sunset to sunrise, the Draft Master Plan ignores that reality.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>As humans our bodies have evolved with specific functions triggered by the time of day and night. It’s why the American Medical Association (AMA) has recognized the value of dark skies (<a href="https://www.ama-assn.org/sites/ama-assn.org/files/corp/media-browser/public/about-ama/councils/Council%20Reports/council-on-science-public-health/a16-csaph2.pdf">https://www.ama-assn.org/sites/ama-assn.org/files/corp/media-browser/public/about-ama/councils/Council%20Reports/council-on-science-public-health/a16-csaph2.pdf</a>) The AMA also adopted guidance to reduce harm from outdoor lighting (<a href="https://www.ama-assn.org/press-center/press-releases/ama-adopts-guidance-reduce-harm-high-intensity-street-lights">https://www.ama-assn.org/press-center/press-releases/ama-adopts-guidance-reduce-harm-high-intensity-street-lights</a>).</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>The AMA states, “Recognizing the detrimental effects of poorly-designed, high-intensity LED lighting, the AMA encourages communities to minimize and control blue-rich environmental lighting by using the lowest emission of blue light possible to reduce glare. The AMA recommends an intensity threshold for optimal LED lighting that minimizes blue-rich light. The AMA also recommends all LED lighting should be properly shielded to minimize glare and detrimental human health and environmental effects, and consideration should be given to utilize the ability of LED lighting to be dimmed for off-peak time periods.”</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>In addition to impacting ourselves, humans disrupt the nocturnal kingdom with excessive artificial light that impinges upon movement, foraging, mating, and predation. The Indiana State Insect, the Say’s Firefly, is at risk in part because bright lights overwhelm its natural communication system. The important contribution of dark skies becomes apparent when we realize the negative consequences of excess nighttime lighting. The International Dark-Sky Association (IDA) offers solutions at <a href="https://www.darksky.org">https://www.darksky.org</a>. The IDA and the Illuminating Engineering Society declared five principles for outdoor lighting:</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>5/2/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>“The availability of several high-quality aquifers provides the IEC with competitive advantages that sets it apart from nearly all of the other megasites of its size throughout the country.” In building atop a large high-quality aquifer, the IEC proposes putting a community’s water supply on the line. If we screw it up—and the possibility has to be considered—will we be creating one of the largest industrial water woes in the country? Does St. Joseph County have the means to monitor water violations and correct any debasement of the aquifer system?</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Why the zeal to eliminate vast tracts of valuable topsoil when there is so much commercial capacity available elsewhere in both unincorporated and incorporated areas of the SJC?</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Industrial growth ought generally to happen within existing industrial areas. For example, the County can support the Renaissance District in South Bend and other county sites where developers have already invested capital. Do we need to widen the donut hole in urban areas by expanding into the agrarian treasures of the county?</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>5/3/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>“A review of the United States Environmental Protection Agency’s (US EPA) Assessment, Cleanup and Redevelopment Exchange (ACRES) System indicates that there are no brownfield sites within the IEC. Why create new brownfields on top of high-quality farmland? Why not reclaim old sites in St. Joseph County? The IEC eyeballs virgin farmland as a clean canvas on which to splash its colors when there are plenty of existing redevelopment opportunities for which infrastructure exists. The IEC model requires stripping the fertile agricultural soils, rendering the area unsuitable for farming in the future. Then you create new acreage that has to be maintained.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bueter@nightwise.org">bueter@nightwise.org</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>I'm a St. Joseph County taxpayer living neither in New Carlisle nor in the proposed IEC acreage. I'd like to hear more about what those residents are saying/writing. Do they want the IEC?</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cackerm1@nd.edu">cackerm1@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>I've read thousands of careful studies. I have a litany of objections to this one. The most egregious being that every study I have ever read provides the appendices. Except this one. At worst that's not legal, and at best it's not transparent. It's also insulting. The careful reader knows the most important information is often in the appendices. How can we evaluate a report that's incomplete?</td>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:carl@c3seeds.com">carl@c3seeds.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>What studies and funds have been used in the last few decades to research the use of properties that are unused or underutilized industrial or residential sites? What studies have been done to examine the lifespan of the IEC? What promises are there that the IEC in 50-100 years will still be utilized?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:carl@c3seeds.com">carl@c3seeds.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>No they do not. While language is given to supporting agribusiness, it does not seem that the same sort of public funds are being given to farmland preservation. If this three pillars were equal in importance, would not the same public dollars spent so far and planned be available to farmers to sell development rights? Many local governments cite the APA American Planning Association. &quot;Policy Guide on Agricultural Land Preservation&quot;, but few actually give real monies or infrastructure to support the language of farmland preservation in real tangible ways.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:carl@c3seeds.com">carl@c3seeds.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>Prioritize redevelopment of old industrial sites. Public funds need to be in place to incentivize private developers to reclaim brownfield sites and the like that have higher cost of rehabilitation, clean up, and implementation as a useable industrial or residential site. Concurrently, implement higher taxes on industries that purchase prime farmland and develop it to decentivize sprawl and destruction of a non renewable resource.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:carolwroblewski@hotmail.com">carolwroblewski@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>Yes, it does capture the desired outcome for the community.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:carolwroblewski@hotmail.com">carolwroblewski@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>The maps are very clear. For those asking questions, because they are not familiar with the project, a large map to refer to should be displayed during public meetings.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:carolwroblewski@hotmail.com">carolwroblewski@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>The county's strategies for gaining public input has been clear and concise. However, I believe the opponents do not want to accept the facts placed before them and, therefore, confusion takes place.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:catgehred@yahoo.com">catgehred@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>No because so far the information about the plan is lacking in detail, and assurances are made with no supporting evidence cited to help reduce public Concern / Clarity. This also makes it difficult to offer comments.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:catgehred@yahoo.com">catgehred@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Jobs that promote the dignity of the person and help them participate in the betterment of society and their community. Jobs as factory workers or drivers are fine but do not tap into the full potential of human beings.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:catgehred@yahoo.com">catgehred@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>I believe it’s a huge asset that we in South Bend do not live next to the 9th largest industrial mega site in the country. And that site is west of us. Winds typically blow from west to East, so any pollution produced there will be quickly breathed in by the lungs of all the people and children living here, with little intervening land (with trees, etc) to help dissipate/clean the pollution. My husband and I have been huge proponents of living in South Bend (I’m originally from the southwest, my husband, from St. Louis). I have to say if this project goes forward my enthusiasm would dampen considerably and I would be less likely to want my children to settle here or even stay here ourselves post-retirement.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:catgehred@yahoo.com">catgehred@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>Planning to create the 9th largest industrial mega site in the nation on prime farmland does not seem to remotely address land conservation. What about a network of industries on a smaller scale that are forward-thinking in terms of sustainability and reduced carbon footprint that are incorporated into green/farmland. We could capitalize on what’s already happening with farming and maybe incentivize smaller farms and get some agri-tourism going there. It’s close to Chicago and would be easy to imagine it becoming a destination for people from the city looking to appreciate nature and see innovative ways humans can work in concert with it, not against it.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:catgehred@yahoo.com">catgehred@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>What is important to understand about the proposed boundaries is the size. This would make it the 9th largest industrial mega site in the nation. That’s very ambitious, and in my opinion problematic, especially since the wording seems to allow for further expansion. Another very important and salient point is that the proposed site is in an area considered to have the conditions of “ideal” farmland. Only 17% of land in the U.S. has that designation, and as a country we’ve already lost millions and millions of those “ideal” acres to development. With weather conditions becoming increasingly erratic trying to preserve good farmland to help provide food security is a must. In these times especially we’re reminded that we cannot take for granted a sufficient global food supply.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:catgehred@yahoo.com">catgehred@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>I consider my husband and myself to be fairly engaged and informed members of the community, and we knew nothing about the possibility and plans for this until OSAA brought it to light. Newspaper articles and TV news stories to get the word out about informational meetings could be helpful. Also, simplifying the process to receive comments would be helpful. This is actually a proposal I’m strongly opposed to, yet here I am on the last day trying to get these in because the process to even leave a comment is quite cumbersome. My parents, who are also opposed, cannot navigate all this. So simplifying this process would help. Having a phone number where people could call and leave comments would be helpful, too.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:catgehred@yahoo.com">catgehred@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>We need to take very seriously the importance of our regional asset of fertile farmland and err on the side of keeping that intact. There's a principle of transparency that seems to have been violated. I'm incredibly disappointed that so many resources ($6 million) have been put towards this project without the public's blessing. It feels like the decision has already been made and that real consideration for the environmental impacts was minimized.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:catgehred@yahoo.com">catgehred@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>I do just want to comment that this whole process for leaving comments is cumbersome. There was a quote in the paper recently by Bill Schalliol (I believe) that said very few comments in opposition had been left. Those in favor should not take that as a sign people are not opposed. The process is overly-difficult which discourages participation in the process.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:catgehred@yahoo.com">catgehred@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>Yes - more open meetings, small group visioning sessions, and more simplified ways to share comments.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:catgehred@yahoo.com">catgehred@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>It does not seem balanced to have a development plan that proposes to use almost 4 times the amount of land that was deemed appropriate in the 2002 County Land Use Plan.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:catgehred@yahoo.com">catgehred@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>The quality of the farmland that would be destroyed in this project and the amount of quality farmland in our country. We should not take land ideal for growing food and turn it into an industrial mega site. Also, this Direct Feedback states our county's air quality is fine, and that shouldn't change with this proposal. There is no data to support that, though, and I find it difficult to believe the 9th largest industrial mega site in the nation sitting just to the west of us (with air currents that will blow in our direction) would have a negligible air pollution impact. Noise pollution for the surrounding area would be important as well.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>The proposed draft must include the appendices before it can be thoroughly reviewed. Furthermore, the plan was placed in printed form in public places that have been closed due to the coronavirus. I would argue that there should be a date extension for public comment until after the appendices are attached and there is reopening of government buildings.</td>
<td>Appendicies</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>I can not evaluate the 24 known archeologic sites found in the proposed area because Appendix D was not included in the plan. I imagine due to the rich, fertile farmland that exist in this proposed area of the IEC, we have likely had cultures that have lived here for hundreds of years. The many values of this rich land and water supply should not be underestimated or undervalued.</td>
<td>Appendicies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>The proposed draft must include the appendices before it can be thoroughly reviewed. Furthermore, the plan was placed in printed form in public places that have been closed due to the coronavirus. I would argue that there should be a date extension for public comment until after the appendices are attached and there is reopening of government buildings. If the plan is allowed, which would in itself be a horrible mistake, we need to understand what specific industries the IEC will attract and how they will uphold to the environmental-green initiative.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>This area is desirable because of it rural nature and historic farming culture. The IEC Industrial Megaplex, by its very definition, would destroy these attributes.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>What type of industry is going to be attracted to develop in this area? You talk about sustainable industry but is this green industry? The vision and guiding principle of the IEC are nicely outlined on page 5 but the location of the IEC is misguided. We must preserve green space and move the industrial park to areas that are desperately in need of redevelopment. The west side of South Bend, along Sample Street, has numerous abandoned factories and brownfield which could be repurposed. This would also have the similar advantages in proximity to truck, rail and air transportation but has an added bonus of bus transportation already in place for workers at the industrial complex.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>If the plan is allowed, which would in itself be a horrible mistake, we need to understand what specific industries the IEC will attract and how they will uphold to the environmental-green initiative.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>The biggest problem that this plan poses, without strict oversight by a non-vested, diverse group of residents and business people who live and work in the area, is further damage to a fragile ecosystem that will be forever lost. The most difficult transition I had after moving from the East Coast, where land is at a premium, to the Midwest is the flagrant disregard for the value of land. Around St. Joseph County are countless areas where we have decaying building and contaminated soil from abandoned industries. Surely we do not want this history to repeat itself. A better plan for future development is to investigate areas of St. Joseph County that have been decimated by industry and rebuild those areas rather then ruin fertile farm land.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>I don’t think you can preserve the region’s character of rural farm living by building this industrial park. The two are not compatible.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>What is the tax advantage for the town of New Carlisle? What percent of the IEC tax base would be directed to the town of New Carlisle with the IEC being constructed outside city limits in Olive Township? Who is going to oversee the use of water and energy to not allow for exceptionally high utilizers to develop in this area. Who is going to oversee the noise and air pollution of an industry interested in developing in this area and not allow for excessive producers to develop here? What say will residents of the surrounding farms and the citizens of New Carlisle have in deciding what industry is allow to build in the IEC area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>On page 35 of the draft, the development team sum up how development has come to exist around the SB area. Your plan states that industrial areas developed naturally due to access to highway, rail and air transportation assets and utility. This statement is exactly why we should look to development of abandoned areas around South Bend and repurpose for new development. This may result in an increase in initial investment due to cleaning up of area abandoned factories and brownfield, but it would place work in an area of the city that is desperate for employment and would preserve green space around the county. This green space could provide local food for residents and be used for the development of bike and pedestrian paths. I’m not sure the bike and walking trails that you propose in the IEC plan would be conducive to healthy living. No one wants to walk or bike around smokestacks and an industrial park. The increased truck traffic would make these shared use paths more dangerous. As it appears in your proposal, the expanded paths are along existing roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>This proposal relies heavily on the rail industry for transportation. Already nearly 100 trains cross this area every day. My fear is additional trains or similar numbers with the possibility of a derailment carrying toxic oil or chemicals leaking and wreaking environmental havoc on our land and water. Not only, the speed and weight of the current trains passing by are already shaking our large brick house on E Michigan Street making us wonder if there is disruption to the geologic stability of the ground that lies below. Has anyone looked at the impact of an earthquake in the area? Who is going to oversee what is traveling through our county by rail?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>In terms of the Electric section, as it appears nearly the entire development of the IEC will depend on carbon emitting energy there is little evaluation of renewable energy except a solar farm. Why have you not looked in to wind energy?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>The biggest problem that this plan poses, without strict oversight by a non-vested, diverse group of residents and business people who live and work in the area, is further damage to a fragile ecosystem that will be forever lost. The most difficult transition I had after moving from the East Coast, where land is at a premium, to the Midwest is the flagrant disregard for the value of land. Around St Joseph County are countless areas where we have decaying building and contaminated soil from abandoned industries. Surely we do not want this history to repeat itself. A better plan for future development is to investigate areas of St. Joseph County that have been decimated by industry and rebuild those areas rather then ruin fertile farm land.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>You have not really spelled out what sustainable industry that you desire to bring in to the area. I only imagine that the industry that would be brought in would be more along the line of what already exist with more smokestacks and polluting industry to land, water, soil, noise and air. If I was a business entrepreneur, I would not open up a clean plant next to polluting plants.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>It is not just about land conservation and green infrastructure, it is also about protecting valuable resources such as water and land from pollution. I see little in this development plan that talks about the increase in noise and air pollution created by this industrial park. The increase in truck traffic alone could impact the residents and downtown area of New Carlisle. My other Concern / Clarity, is who is going to maintain the conservation spaces and multiuse walking trails? Who is going to oversee the industries that are going into the IEC to assure that they are going to preserve the green initiative. We need to be heading in a green direction to save the planet and much of what exist in the current IEC area are not environmentally friendly as we see from the endless smoke emitted from the smokestacks and the industries that have been built there to date. Why would green industry choose to build their business here?</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>I have many objections to what I see in this chapter and have never read a Direct Feedback without appendices. What are you trying to hide? I am particularly frustrated that you did not include the appendices E - I that described the water supply, aquifers and wastewater utility, assessment of the Niespodziany ditch and delineated wetlands and flood plains. We can not assess how these might be impacted by development of the 7200 acres IEC project without evaluation of these Direct Feedbacks. You describe that a small area of the IEC is in a 100 year flood plain but we have seen in the last 4 years both a 500 year flood and a 1000 year flood in the South Bend area. Flooding and contamination from run off from these industrial sites could greatly impact the New Carlisle water supply.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>St Joseph County needs to tell us why other areas, that have been abandoned and left as waste land, have not been looked at for development of industry prior to potentially losing more valuable farm land. Areas in particular around West South Bend along Sample street or near the South Bend Airport.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>You comment about the advantage of this location having access to major Midwest and East Coast markets with extensive transportation and logistic advantages with a robust regional workforce. I would argue that there are other areas closer to the airport and with larger populations to pull from (as in the west side of South Bend or unused land directly around the airport) that would be equally suited for development. People can still live in New Carlisle which is a great place to live and play but travel to areas to work as many of us already do. What would be great is to increase public transportation by bus or train from work sites in Western South Bend to New Carlisle to alleviate private car transportation and decrease carbon fuel emissions.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>The IEC Developing committee needs to explore other areas around St Joseph County that have already been destroyed by industrialization and now are eyesores of abandoned factories and contaminated brownfield. The community of New Carlisle does not wish to have this pristine farmland destroyed, a valuable resource that we will never get back.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>St Joseph County needs to tell us why other areas, that have been abandoned and left as waste land, have not been looked at for development of industry prior to potentially losing more valuable farm land. Areas in particular around West South Bend along Sample street or near the South Bend Airport.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Responsible growth and development in this area protects the farmer and rural community living which is why many of us choose to live here. Responsible Development limits the environmental impact on on water, soil, air and noise pollution. I am not convinced that the IEC, in it proposed state, has satisfied these conditions. As I understand it, this 7200 Industrial Megaplex violates the St Joseph County 2002 ordinance to limit land development for industrial use to 2000 acres in a single area. This area, as you eluded to in this Direct Feedback, already has developed 2200 acres which exceeds the County ordinance.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?

We all desire to see South Bend and the surrounding area thrive. What is disturbing about the proposed plan is the development of 7200 acre industrial park on some of the most fertile farmland in Northern Indiana. You boast about bringing in the 9th largest industrial megasite in the U.S which goes against the 2002 Comprehensive St Joseph County land use plan limiting industry to 2000 acres in a single area. The area for proposed IEC development already has 2200 acres of industry.

No the guiding principles do not capture the desired outcome of residents in the area, Most of us are residence in New Carlisle because we desire to live in an area that is quiet, clean and rural. We agree that increased business in the area is needed to sustain the South Bend and surrounding communities however the location of the IEC would threaten farmland in this area. At 7200 acres, you brag that the IEC would be the 9th largest industrial mega-led in the US. This statement alone make me realize how out of touch the developers of this plan are with the people of Olive township and New Carlisle. Furthermore, that exceeds the 2002 Comprehensive County land use limiting industrial land use to 2000 acres. Olive Township already is at this max of 2000 acres.

Responsible growth and development in this area protects the farmer and rural community living which is why many of us choose to live here. Responsible Development limits the environmental impact on on water, soil, air and noise pollution. I am not convinced that the IEC, in it proposed state, has satisfied these conditions. As I understand it, this 7200 Industrial Megaplex violates the St Joseph County 2002 ordinance to limit land development for industrial use to 2000 acres in a single area. This area, as you eluded to in this Direct Feedback, already has developed 2200 acres which exceeds the County ordinance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>It seems you over stated the public input in the planning process. The public meetings and inclusion of New Carlisle residents, I would argue was an afterthought as the strategic plan for the IEC was well in the development stage prior to our knowledge and getting our input. Many of the residents in and around New Carlisle are not in favor of this plan as evident by all the No IEC yard signs. The development of this Industrial Megaplex would change the reason why many of us choose to live here and forever change the rural, peaceful farming community which we love.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>In this chapter, you talk about the resident stakeholders, I would argue that we have been of little Concern / Clarity in the drafting of the IEC plan. It was only when we organized in opposition did you start adding in language to appease our Concern / Clarities. It is difficult to totally evaluate this draft when all appendices have been left out of this Direct Feedback. I would argue that the public needs more time to review when the appendices are added. The public should also have more time to review because public places where this Direct Feedback has been placed for reading are closed down due to COVID-19.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cbonsign62@gmail.com">cbonsign62@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Preservation and business directed to farm culture and lifestyle similar to what exist at Fair Oaks Farm. A business directed at farming with educational classrooms and hands on experience with mentors from our community that have had farms in their families for hundreds of years. This is why many of us choose to live here with our humble, honest hard-working farmers. We have much to learn from them. To turn these farms into an industrial park is a travesty!</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ccobb@saintmarys.edu">ccobb@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>No. The fundamental problem with the Vision Statement and the Guiding Principles is that they pretend that a megaplex site can be built on thousands of acres of farmland adjacent to a small town without harming the farmland or the town. Its &quot;guiding principles&quot; are a set of abstractions that have no connection to the actual reality of a massive industrial and commercial development constructed within a TIF Allocation Area. Given what the plan is actually proposing to do, the principles listed in the introduction to the Area Management Plan are not in any way the actual guiding principles for the project. They may represent what people in the region actually want, but that has no bearing on what the Economic Development Division is already trying to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Email: ccobb@saintmarys.edu  
Date: 4/27/2020  
Question: Consider, for example, the first principle: a "Strong Economy."  
Comment: A "Strong Economy" is a fine thing. This development, however, cannot itself create a "strong economy." The real issue for the public is whether this development would bring actual benefit to the real communities that it would affect, or would its economic benefits go instead to the corporate interests driving the development. The explanation of how a strong economy would be a guiding principle does NOTHING to justify its application to this case. This expansion asserts that a "strong economy" will help the local tax base. Because any new tax revenue will be captured by the TIF for decades to come, however, the local tax base will not benefit from this development at all. New Carlisle is still waiting to experience the great revenue benefits that were promised when industrial development was first pushed into the I-20 corridor over thirty years ago. The county government similarly has seen little revenue come back, as millions of dollars of potential tax revenue has been poured back into the production of glossy pdfs like this one that promise much and deliver little. The claim that economic development will benefit the local tax base is not a "guiding principle." It is a FALSE PROMISE. The representation of false promises as principles is typical of the entire vision statement, and it would probably be a fair way to characterize the entire Direct Feedback. Let's look at a few more here. The "Strong Economy" principle also includes the following statement: "Investment within the IEC will improve the region’s economic performance in a way that strengthens and connects the region’s natural and cultural assets." The actual physical...
Given what we have already discovered by considering the nature of the plan’s first two so-called guiding principles, we can already see how the principles of “Thriving Environment,” “Community Resilience,” and “Livable and Healthy Communities” are all good qualities that the IEC would diminish rather than enhance, so they can hardly be called “guiding principles” for the project. The last principle, however, “Coordination and Collaboration,” requires a bit more comment, because the meaning of this principle for the IEC plan has to be assessed on the basis of the plan itself as an instance of coordination and collaboration. Generally speaking, it’s not good practice to make a raft of false promises to people with whom one is coordinating or collaborating. The purpose of false promises is to mislead and manipulate, and these practices cannot be considered collaboration. The practice of the Economic Development Division and their team of consultants has not at any point demonstrated any authentic interest in collaboration by the standards appropriate to planning as carried out by local governments on behalf of the citizens of a community. “Coordination and Collaboration,” then, must also be understood as in this Direct Feedback not as a principle guiding development but as a FALSE PROMISE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ccobb@saintmarys.edu">ccobb@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>It would be interesting to see a Direct Feedback that lays out the actual principles that have guided the IEC planning process. I suggest that they can be found in the Direct Feedback prepared for prospective developers, the Indiana Enterprise Center Marketing Strategy Direct Feedback, which was completed in January of 2019. It is altogether indicative of the status of the entire Area Management Plan as a FALSE PROMISE Direct Feedback designed to mislead the public that in this project, it was decided how to market the IEC long before any real consideration was given of how to manage the IEC, and that despite the claims that appear in this Direct Feedback about collaboration, the public was not invited into designing the process of how to market their communities to the developers who are being invited to come in and take them over.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ccobb@saintmarys.edu">ccobb@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>They are clear and concise, but they appear to be terms of convenience created to allay public alarm about the scale of development. Nothing in the Direct Feedback suggests that developers wouldn't be perfectly happy to redefine these boundaries whenever convenient, such as when they see an opportunity to get a Toll Road exit near the IEC. Unless and until firm commitments to limiting the scale of development are put forward and approved by elected officials, no terminology about the different &quot;areas&quot; in the project will be trustworthy.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ccobb@saintmarys.edu">ccobb@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>Sustainable energy project in wind and solar would be compatible with the agricultural character of the area and would not threaten its hydrology or its water resources. Smaller advanced manufacturing projects that could use empty land already zoned for industrial use have the potential to provide beneficial development for the community, if they use renewable energy and are non-polluting.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ccobb@saintmarys.edu">ccobb@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain development within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>The fact that all of the land being proposed for development is productive farmland with irreplaceable rich soil should significantly constrain developmental impacts. The health of the aquifer also constrains development in ways that are not yet acknowledged by the plan. The presence of rural residential neighborhoods at the northern and eastern edges of the defined development area should also be a constraint on development, and this one in particular receives virtually no acknowledgement anywhere in the Direct Feedback. These area residents would be affected by development and are already being affected by existing industrial development even more than the residents of New Carlisle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ccobb@saintmarys.edu">ccobb@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>The importance of protecting fertile topsoil, the risks of contaminating the aquifer, the impacts on residents who live along the north and east sides of the proposed development area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:ccobb@saintmarys.edu">ccobb@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>Date: 4/27/2020</td>
<td>Question: 3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Comment: The treatment of wetlands in this chapter stands out as an example of how planning that is profoundly insufficient is being misleadingly represented as actually taking environmental protection seriously. The plan claims that significant work has been done on wetlands, although it doesn’t include that work in the main body of the report: “Additional information on the delineated wetlands and mitigation strategies (e.g., avoidance and minimization, land acquisition, onsite mitigation, offsite mitigation, in lieu fee, mitigation banking) is provided in Appendix I” (p. 66). Appendix I, of course, doesn’t exist, but the Table of Contents describes Appendix I as “Wetland Delineation Study.” That doesn’t sound like it actually covers the promised information. A look into the “Environmental Reports” section of the IEC website confirms that less work has been done on wetlands than the plan claims. In that area, there is a “Wetland Delineation Study,” which consists of a single map, showing that part of the IEC area has been surveyed for wetlands, part will be surveyed in future, and part is not included in any study. All the Direct Feedback shows is where the wetlands are, their general type, and the required mitigation ratio of acres of new wetlands that must be created if these types of wetlands are destroyed. That is very far from being a plan. Since the plan is proposing to run rail spurs right through the center of these identified wetlands, as usual there appears to be a complete disconnect between the planning principles that the plan appears to endorse and the actual plans under development. As usual, the status of the whole Direct Feedback as a FALSE PROMISE where any consideration of...</td>
<td>Category: Environmental</td>
<td>Chapter: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ccobb@saintmarys.edu">ccobb@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>The way all of the &quot;concept area&quot; images represent development as lovely purple building surrounded by trees is profoundly misleading. These developments would replace agricultural fields? Where are these trees going to come from? If they were planted, and the plan says nothing about requiring all development sites to be reforested, they would take decades to mature. I don't see any of the existing industrial sites being reforested around the plants. These images, then, are envisioning an imaginary future that there is no intention to create. That's lying to the public, just without words. The paucity of this section's consideration of environmental issues is also highly problematic. There is minimal coordination between the &quot;concept areas&quot; being presented here and the (still insufficient) actual consideration of environmental issues in chapter 3 of the plan. To cite the most glaring example, the rail spurs envisioned as providing access to concept areas B and C run right through the center of the wetland areas that other parts of the Direct Feedback give lip service to protecting. There is a complete disconnect between the plans for development and any environmental principles that the Direct Feedback presents.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ccobb@saintmarys.edu">ccobb@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>If there were a real commitment to the need to maintain the region’s characteristics, the scale of growth being proposed should be reduced by about 90%, and the areas targeted would be integrated into the existing industrial footprint around the Norfolk and Southern railroad line.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ccobb@saintmarys.edu">ccobb@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>No. The promotion of these activities beyond the level currently existing in this area is in violation of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. It is thus entirely inappropriate. The main current use of the land, which is agricultural, is the only potential use of the land that should be under consideration for 90% of the land included in the IEC. There is already a lot of empty land that is industrially zoned in that area and in other parts of St. Joseph County, not to mention brownfields in need of redevelopment. Targeting thousands of acres of agricultural land is simply wrong.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ccobb@saintmarys.edu">ccobb@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>The IEC aims to bring about development on a scale that is in vast violation of the County's Comprehensive Land Use Plan. It should only go forward for approval on the basis of the kind of broad, multi-faceted solicitation of public input that forms the basis of valid Comprehensive plan. That involves multiple public meetings dedicated exclusively to the plan and held throughout the county. In involves focus groups, professionally and impartially conducted surveys, and so on. The fact that the Marketing Strategy for the IEC has already been developed and implemented shows that this &quot;welcoming&quot; of future discussions is all a sham. The ones controlling the IEC planning process have already decided what to do, and everything that that has been done recently with respect to public outreach has simply been aiming to provide cover for what's already happening and to find a way to get around deep public opposition. The procedures for good land-use planning are already well established and have been applied for decades. You don't need to ask the public to find out what they are. If you wanted to use them to engage the public properly, you would already have done so, and the Planning office would not have been sidelined throughout the planning process.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ccobb@saintmarys.edu">ccobb@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Some of the errors in representing the history of public engagement on the project have been corrected, but others remain. It is indicative of the IEC planning’s failure to engage the public effectively that the plan cannot even give an accurate account of what has been done, which has been haphazard and ad hoc, taking place pretty much whenever the Economic Development Division has been pushed into doing it. It’s never been done proactively and authentically.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chambargertcb@gmail.com">chambargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>From a lifelong Olive twp. resident: Existing development already detracts from quality of life for miles around. Excessive lighting has ruined night sky viewing. Emissions and man-made clouds are an eyesore to say the least and impossible to ignore. This IEC plan continues to strip away the area advantages that let me to live and invest in the area.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chambargertcb@gmail.com">chambargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>Heavy truck traffic on SR2 / US20 between South Bend and Michigan City has greatly increased since the Toll Road was privatized, leading to an unacceptable number of accidents (see Tribune articles and state DOT). Just ask a New Prairie bus driver how long it takes to cross or turn onto SR 2. Adding more truck traffic from a hugely expanded IEC will once again degrade the quality of life for area residents.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chambargertcb@gmail.com">chambargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>History shows St. Joe county will promote and subsidize ANY business. The car shredder - not an improvement for New Carlisle. The man-made cloud from the power plant is a beacon visible for miles around, advertising hardcore industry and detracting from what is great about the area. If not for the wise and earnest protests of residents, county leaders would have welcomed the infeasible Tondu coal plant. Now we are expected to trust vague mentions that the county will carefully regulate or turn away any industrial prospect? Fat chance.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chambargertcb@gmail.com">chambargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Tax abatements, TIF-funded infrastructure, and other corporate giveaways serve to remove heathy, realistic risk from industrial development. This makes it too easy for businesses to abandon their subsidized investment and leave behind a mess. &quot;Build it and they will come&quot; is a bad idea for the long term, and a poor trade for destroying productive farmland forever.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chambargertcb@gmail.com">chambargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>In what universe does permanently removing 7,200 acres from agricultural production &quot;preserve agricultural land&quot; (page 105)? A bike path through an &quot;industrial mega site&quot; is lipstick on the pig. The idea that agriculture can coexist amongst massive rezoning is fiction and lip service, given the affect on land values. The decisions of one landowner to sell, enabled by county rezoning, affects the land value of his neighbor, making continuation of farming impractical.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chambargertcb@gmail.com">chambargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Scrap this plan and the New Carlisle TIF district. Channel area taxes into traditional county needs that serve the people, not give aways to business. Partner with South Bend to RE-develop sample street, the Bendix area, South Michigan street, etc. Investment in those areas would be the RESPONSIBLE way to address the area's dismal industrial legacy and stigma, while preserving one of the best parts of the county.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chambargertcb@gmail.com">chambargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>Limit industrial development in western St Joe county to the existing 2,200 acres, as specified by the 2002 land use plan, as requested by the New Carlisle town board and township trustees, the commissioner representing the area, over 1000 who signed the OSAA petition, and the many who purchased anti-IEC yard signs. Enough is enough. Expansion to 7,200 acres including rail yards etc. is unreasonable and unfair to existing residents.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chambargertcb@gmail.com">chambargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>This plan does nothing to &quot;celebrate, preserve or protect&quot; what is great about Olive township. This give-away to big business only penalizes current residents who love the area. History shows the St. Joe county is great at producing dismal, unused post-industrial sprawl that lingers for generations. Here we go again. Enough is enough!</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chetler@gmail.com">chetler@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2/26/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly oppose this development project. We need to focus county dollars on small business opportunities and infrastructure. We also have a health and housing crisis in our county. Funds would be better spent providing permanent supportive housing, local detox facilities, and more mental health care providers.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chambargertcb@gmail.com">chambargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>The plan neglects to show the reservation to which we native Olive twp. residents are supposed to relocate, to make room for the county's giant boondoggle. What a mistake to live in a county that prioritizes industry give aways and resource exploitation over the wishes of generational residents and protection of our agricultural land. How can you ignore in this county the mess that industry leaves behind sooner or later?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chambargertcb@gmail.com">chambargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>How does expanding the already huge TIF area benefit local residents? The existence of I/N TEK, Unifrax and other area development from past decades to now did not prevent the necessity for public tax referendum increases to improve New Prairie Schools, create a fire territory, or build the NC library. No, those industry dollars go to an unregulated slush fund perpetuating unwanted industrial sprawl, with no end in sight.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chumbargertcb@gmail.com">chumbargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>How disingenuous to state in a &quot;mega industrial park&quot; plan that the county &quot;prioritizes air quality&quot; and &quot;preserving and protecting the natural environment&quot;. I can only infer from the park pictures included that we are supposed to be grateful county leaders are not yet proposing to industrialize Bendix Woods and Spicer Lake too. Air quality that is currently &quot;acceptable&quot; is given as a reason to bring on more polluters, trucks and railyards. This from the people who almost brought us the Tondu coal plant catastrophe! The people were right on that one too. And current county behavior Concern / Claritying the IEC gives us no reason to trust that the &quot;county should implement specific measures&quot; such that the IEC mega industrial site &quot;not negatively impact the region's unique agricultural character and natural environment&quot; as it paves over productive farmland. What a sad joke and insult to our intelligence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chumbargertcb@gmail.com">chumbargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>It is time to stop the fantasy that this ruinous plan has community support. Western St Joe county already has its fair share of industry. Any more is out of reasonable balance, and permanently damages what is great about the area. Northwest Indiana has plenty of post-industrial areas to clean up and RE-develop. Get to work on that!</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chumbargertcb@gmail.com">chumbargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>The RE-development department should focus on cleaning up the existing legacy of post-industrial brownfields. &quot;Industrial megasites&quot; by definition overwhelm the character of the area that residents love. Massive zoning changes are unfair, skewing neighboring land values, making nearby use for farming/residence impractical and undesirable.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chumbargertcb@gmail.com">chumbargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>From a lifelong Olive twp. resident: The vision should be to REdevelop the dismal and plentiful post-industrial brownfields in the county, not to make more of them! A rust-belt community should know better. Paving over productive farmland with industrial sprawl does not promote a &quot;thriving environment&quot;. An &quot;industrial megasite&quot; is by definition incompatible with the &quot;small town charm and agricultural character&quot; the plan supposedly &quot;preserves&quot;. Large scale rezoning is not complimentary to existing area land use.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chumbargertcb@gmail.com">chumbargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>From a lifelong Olive township resident: The New Carlisle council, Olive trustees and the commissioner representing the area have ALL voted against this plan. Area residents have voiced their opposition. Enough is enough!</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chumbargertcb@gmail.com">chumbargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>The plan violates the 2002 county land use plan. The New Carlisle council / Olive trustee resolution unanimously showed their opposition to this plan. The inclusion of OSAA opponents who went to the county in total protest of the plan as &quot;steering committee&quot; members was a dishonest tactic, meant to convey their agreement with the plan. Not surprising though, given the county's behavior throughout this process. That a commissioner would discourage publication of the secret land &quot;target acquisition list&quot; is only one example of backroom dealings that destroy public trust. If you can't get favorable votes to relocate a ditch, simply replace the longtime serving commissioner on the drainage board who represents the majority of the county's agricultural areas. And when citizens fill regular county meetings in opposition to the plan, that does not count as &quot;community outreach&quot;.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chumbargertcb@gmail.com">chumbargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>Don't plow ahead with land purchases (Willow Road, etc), even as area opposition has been clearly communicated (and ignored). The plan has no commitments to limit the size and type of development. Hold several public input meetings IN NEW CARLISLE, outside of normal work hours, and listen to the people! The plan already pretends that this has happened.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chumbargertcb@gmail.com">chumbargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>The 2,200 acres already developed is more than our fair share. So says the 2002 county land use plan, the recent unanimous NC town council / Olive twp trustee resolution, over 1000 who have signed the OSSA petition, and the many who have purchased anti-IEC yard signs or voiced opposition at county meetings. County officials have stated that the IEC does not affect 22,000 acres. Yet even the current version shows a &quot;plan area&quot; of that size. Clearly the county has &quot;plans&quot; that will negatively impact landowners outside the 7,200 acre core area. There is no commitment or limits to contain the size and type of future development.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chumbargertcb@gmail.com">chumbargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>The two commissioners pushing the IEC plan do not represent the area. They have overridden and ignored the votes and opinions of the commissioner who does. We in Olive twp. are unable to vote against them. Unfair! They should concentrate their efforts to clean up industrial brownfields in their own areas. There are plenty in the county.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chumbargertcb@gmail.com">chumbargertcb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/21/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>I first heard of the &quot;NW Industrial Logistics Center Master Plan&quot; of June 20, 2018 at a meeting 2 years ago at the NC library organized by the OSAA group. The map showed industrial land zoning in a huge area from Timothy to Tulip roads and from north of US20 south to the CN railroad. Did county officials expect area residents to jump for joy? They seem surprised that for many, this is our worst nightmare! Ridiculous in scale, a bad neighbor, making land values incompatible with current farm usage, destroying quality of life for those who invested and love the area for its rural character. I have not been aware of &quot;community outreach&quot; meetings held in New Carlisle in the last 2 years, even as many have voiced their protest at county meetings downtown and in the paper. Yet land purchases (willow road, etc) and consulting work forges ahead unfettered. Hold several meetings for input at the library in New Carlisle, outside normal work hours, and listen to the people whether you like what we say or not!</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cksnay@yahoo.com">cksnay@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/20/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>I think the adverse effects on people's health should be a constraint on the further development of this site.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cksnay@yahoo.com">cksnay@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Some aspects of agribusiness may make sense given the nature of New Carlisle. But large-scale industrial farms, CAFOs, and the pollution and environmental degradation they bring are not suitable alternatives. Small, sustainable farms (The Lean Farm, Ben Hartman) and artisanal businesses might be considered. Education, Health/Medical, and Culture and Entertainment (performing/visual arts) could also be options worth exploring. I also don’t believe that &quot;Advanced Manufacturing&quot; is going to provide the number of jobs that is projected. As I understand it, advanced manufacturing takes advantage of robots to perform most of the work employing very few people. This is exactly what Andrew Yang’s presidential bid was about; jobs being automated throwing more people out of work or casting them into lower-wage jobs.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cksnay@yahoo.com">cksnay@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>3/15/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>No. The plan seems to offer solutions to problems that are ill-defined and misidentified. It doesn’t address the impact on the health and well-being of residents. It doesn’t address the climate crisis and how farmers may be able to mitigate it. I am resistant to the notion, all too eagerly embraced here -- that the only answer to any problem is more manufacturing, advanced or otherwise.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cksnay@yahoo.com">cksnay@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>3/15/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>One of the things that struck me as ironic is that on page 1 in the first sentence, the IEC is described as one of the “best kept development secrets.” That should say a lot. A secret from whom? Why keep it a secret? This opacity does not build a foundation for trust or cooperation. It frequently refers to a &quot;highly collaborative process.&quot; Collaborative with whom? Certainly not the residents of New Carlisle. And outside of New Carlisle, very few county residents are aware of this issue. On page 5, it says, &quot;Community stakeholders will have a voice in ongoing implementation efforts, WHERE POSSIBLE.&quot; [emphasis added]. When is it possible? When it's convenient? When it conforms to the Redevelopment Committee's already developed plan? No one is against development. No one is against building a strong economy. What I am against is creating another potential environmental disaster that will eventually degrade residents’ health and well-being. Government officials seem to prioritize business, tax bases, the economy over the people who live and work in St. Joe County. This seems to be another instance of creating more environmental injustice that we will at some point in the future have to address, just as in East Chicago. I would urge county officials to pay more attention to the people who live here already rather than try to attract new residents to grow the tax base.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cksnay@yahoo.com">cksnay@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/20/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>Sustainable farming, renewable energies, eco tourism, performing arts education, such as Interlochen, MI. I thought farming was a business.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cksnay@yahoo.com">cksnay@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/20/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>Bendix Woods, Spicer Lake County Park.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cksnay@yahoo.com">cksnay@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/20/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>There hasn't been an adequate explanation of why one of St. Joe County's existing brownfields couldn't be used for industrial development. It seems there are old factories and other sites around the County that are looking for redevelopment. Use those.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cksnay@yahoo.com">cksnay@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Slow and steady wins the race. And sustainable. Green economy jobs, clean energy jobs, sustainable farming. If you want to do advanced manufacturing, put it in areas of the county that are already developed for that: brownfields.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cksnay@yahoo.com">cksnay@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>3/15/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>Not especially. Here in this Direct Feedback, it claims 7,200 acres. But in other Direct Feedbacks I have seen it listed as 6,000. Every Direct Feedback, every announcement seems to cite a different number. I'm not sure why it needs to be MORE than the 2,200 already in the plan.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cksnay@yahoo.com">cksnay@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>Absolutely not! Making this process transparent is paramount. Neither the people whose land is being rezoned nor the tax payers in other parts of the county have been informed about the county’s plans that they seem to be making on their behalf. There needs to be better coverage on the broadcast news (tv and radio) and the newspapers; not just tiny one-inch &quot;announcement&quot; buried in the paper or put on obscure website that no one could find even if they knew to look for it. If this is such a great plan that is so beneficial to all involved, why was it hidden from residents? I live in Granger, and none of my neighbors has any idea what the IEC is that their tax dollars have been spend on feasibility studies and pr consultants and surveys. You should offer public town hall meetings in various parts of the county at times when people can actually attend them and not at 9 a.m. when people are either at work or school. Letters to property owners and tax payers outlining the project or at least telling people where to go to find more information.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cksnay@yahoo.com">cksnay@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>I think the operative word in the first paragraph of your conclusion is &quot;shared.&quot; This is NOT a &quot;shared&quot; vision. It doesn't reflect shared values and it doesn't respect the Concern / Claritys or experiences of many of the people who live in New Carlisle or in other parts of the county. I would like to see a plan that presents not just the happy talk and advantages of a plan, but also its disadvantages. All plans, including plans that could be labeled &quot;sustainable&quot; or &quot;green&quot; have downsides. I think all the happy talk and visions offered through rose-colored glasses have done this effort a grave disservice. There are other enterprise zones throughout the country. How does this compare? What problems have other communities had with those developments that we could avoid? What mistakes did they make that we could learn from? There needs to be an analysis of other developments that could be used to inform ours. Honestly, I think you need to start over. Talk to your constituents and stakeholders. Put together a community board or panel that understands all the issues and can represent the interests better than they are being represented currently. Hire new consultants.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cksnay@yahoo.com">cksnay@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>3/15/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>I was totally unaware that there were any workshops, public meetings, or focus groups until just now. Were these promoted in the newspapers? Posted on the County website? Sent out as an email or a physical mailer to residents? Were they posted at local libraries? Was it on the news? Was it distributed through local political parties, both Democratic and Republican? One thing I found disappointing about the &quot;opinion poll&quot; that was performed by the PR firm, Big Idea and Lou Pierce, is that it was distributed via social media. You've already limited your pool of respondents by selecting that method. The respondents were also allowed to self select, which further skews the results. Why not do a RANDOM survey conducted in various locations around SJC: Downtown New Carlisle, University Park Mall, Farmers Market in South Bend, Eddy Street Commons, for example. Secondly, no one, not even county officials, seems to know where the buck stops or who is responsible for what. At the recent debate of county commissioners at IUSB, an audience member asked who they need to appeal to in order to register their Concern / Claritys about the IEC, and none of them knew. They deferred to Andy Kostielny who happened to be sitting in the back of the room. Then at the recent Council meeting, Mr. Morton had to defer to the Council's counsel in order to answer that question. The buck keeps getting passed from one group to another so that constituents are left running in circles. Is this how our democracy works? Baffle them with BS so that development plans can be passed through with very little buy in or discussion?</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cmhgorilla@gmail.com">cmhgorilla@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/13/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Its already been proven we do not have the workforce for such a project. It's not desirable to bring in an outside workforce</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cmhgorilla@gmail.com">cmhgorilla@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/13/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Destroying an aquifer that we depend on. It's been proven fresh water will be fragile and important resource for the future.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:coalter3@aol.com">coalter3@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/30/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>We moved here from Chicago to get away from the millions of people. The charm of the rural, non-congested area was wonderful. Chapter 2 is frightening because it will make this area like the industrial suburbs of Chicago. New Carlisle is currently a vibrant and livable community. IEC will forever change that and not for the better. Once the IEC has its way, New Carlisle won’t be a charming historical town of 2,000, it will grow exponentially and become congested and look exactly like all other areas that have been industrialized. What drew many of us here, what many of us love about the area will be destroyed.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:coalter3@aol.com">coalter3@aol.com</a></td>
<td>4/9/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>These questions guide the response. The question should be, &quot;Are the businesses besides Agribusiness a good idea?&quot; The answer would be no. The only business that should be considered for the area is to leave the land the way it is so it can be farmed. We who live here do not want our natural resources destroyed and/or exploited by outside interests. In light of supposed support for Agribusiness, it makes no sense to destroy the very farmland from which it comes.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:coalter3@aol.com">coalter3@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/30/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>The boundaries are clear. When the region’s natural and cultural assets (farmland, woodlands, small farming community) will be destroyed by this project, &quot;Investment within the IEC will improve the region’s economic performance in a way that strengthens and connects the region’s natural and cultural assets&quot; simply can’t happen.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:coalter3@aol.com">coalter3@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/30/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>It becomes very clear how much this will benefit industry and not benefit the current residents and our lifestyle. This is a sales pitch to industry, not to the residents of New Carlisle. Another of my Concern / Clarity is that each summer there are air quality alerts in our area indicating pollution levels and advising vulnerable groups to take precautions. The number of alerts, as well as the heat index, will only increase when woods and farmland are turned into industrial buildings, parking lots, concrete, and asphalt. During the growing season a single acre of corn not only removes about 8 tons of carbon dioxide from the air but produces enough oxygen for 131 people for a year. It makes no sense to create an industrial park that will inherently deplete oxygen production and increase pollution.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:coalter3@aol.com">coalter3@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/30/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Valuable land and water resources cannot possibly be protected and connected through &quot;a network of green infrastructure comprised of conservation buffers, park expansions, trails, and more&quot;, simply because the valuable land will be covered in asphalt and concrete. No one wants to hike through an industrial park. We're already prosperous, connected and resilient, so I cannot see why this &quot;vision&quot; is being promoted. Industrial interest is diametrically opposed to agricultural interests. Again, agriculture cannot be sustained when covered in concrete and asphalt.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:coalter3@aol.com">coalter3@aol.com</a></td>
<td>4/9/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>All of it needs more public input. I'm not seeing that the community is asking for this as evidenced by the unanimous vote by the New Carlisle Town Council on February 18 to pass a resolution calling for a moratorium on the implementation of the Indiana Enterprise Center.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:coalter3@aol.com">coalter3@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/30/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>It absolutely does not capture desired outcomes! As per the request of the town council, the Comprehensive Plan, passed in 2002 (and conveniently left out of chapter 1) should be adhered to.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:coalter3@aol.com">coalter3@aol.com</a></td>
<td>4/9/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>We live in a democracy, but this development being forced upon the New Carlisle Community has neither been suggested by the residents, nor have the residents been permitted to vote on it. I was horrified when I learned of the IEC's plans and am even more appalled after reading this Direct Feedback. The quiet rural lifestyle that attracted us here will no longer exist after industry has moved in. I'd much rather see woods and corn and bean fields than buildings and parking lots. We personally lost an acre of woodlands to AEP's expansion. The lovely, wooded end of our property was destroyed in a matter of days and we could do nothing about it. I feel the loss keenly. As decent people, we have an obligation to pass the earth along to the next generation in as good as or better shape than we found it. The IEC's plan to destroy farmland and woods to create an industrial park will not permit that to happen.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:coalter3@aol.com">coalter3@aol.com</a></td>
<td>4/9/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>Rural and City dwellers have different ideas on the topic of land conservation and green infrastructure. Having lived in Chicago for many years, I know that to city dwellers, a green space is plants on the balcony or roof, a small backyard, public parks. Having grown up in the middle of corn and bean fields, I know that to rural people, a green space is miles and miles of woods and fields. The plans for this venture are not coming from residents in the area but are being forced upon us by those outside.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:contyrm361@aol.com">contyrm361@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>The highlighted areas citing the positives of the New Carlisle Community will be destroyed if the IEC is allowed to invade our area. The very things that make this area a treasure to live in is what we want to preserve, and will be lost if the IEC is permitted. There isn’t enough of a buffer zone to hide the ugliness and traffic associated with the IEC.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:countrym316@icloud.com">countrym316@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>The Aquifer needs to be protected, due diligence would suggest the Peerless Water study be taken into great consideration (&quot;Aquifer is HIGHLY Susceptible to contamination&quot; &amp; Aquifer is Susceptible to Contamination&quot;) Prepare for future growth by protecting the water supply. The only way Concern / Clarity will be reduced is if St.Joe county doesn't proceed with any more industrial development.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Countrym361@aol.com">Countrym361@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>The boundaries have never been clear, as they continue to change. It seems the smaller boundaries are for Phase One of development? It seems the County is using the Harry S. Truman thinking of ‘if you can’t convince them, confuse them.’ strategy.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:countrym361@aol.com">countrym361@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>There are currently Several job openings advertised, and Have bee advertised in Olive and Greene township. IF there was a reputable company that wanted to come in and thought there would be enough employees, they would be here already.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:countrym361@aol.com">countrym361@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure</td>
<td>We currently have land conservation and green infrastructure, we won’t have this if the IEC is allowed to happen, because it will be overshadowed by the IEC.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should</td>
<td>ião</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be considering?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:countrym361@aol.com">countrym361@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence</td>
<td>No. St. Joe County needs to clean up the already trashed, ruined, broken down business areas it ALREADY have as business areas. You can not continue to sprawl the business area while taking over clean farm fields. You will only make citizens want to leave the area. Reduce public Concern / Clarity? Clean up what you have, use what is already ruined.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>about development within the IEC?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:countrym361@aol.com">countrym361@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the</td>
<td>Growth should be the COR and soybeans, and other crops growing in our area, that is what is meant to be here. If you want to create jobs in St. Joe County, create jobs for people to clean up, fix and rehab the Lincolway West corridor from the SB airport towards the downtown area, THAT needs growth and development, not any more boarded up businesses.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:countrym361@aol.com">countrym361@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>There is no uncontrolled sprawl in the New Carlisle Community. I DO see uncontrolled sprawl in South Bend, especially as I drive in for meetings at the County City building. There are at least 25 vacant/for sale/for rent/boarded up store fronts on Lincolnway West alone, between the SB Airport and Lafayette. That is Only a small stretch of the business corridor, there are SO many more in the downtown area. Use TIF money to improve these already ‘in need of improvement’ areas which are not generating anything positive for the area. THIS area (Lincolnway West toward the downtown) is the first thing people will see coming from the SB Airport, what a negative impression that must have on possible businesses. Clean up needs to be done in this area before you come into our clean beautiful areas of already tax contributing farm fields.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:countrym361@aol.com">countrym361@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>The Peerless water study shows The Aquifer is either susceptible and/or Highly susceptible to contamination. This statement alone should have put a halt to any development. WHY was Spent on the Peerless study, if it was only for saying a study was done and not to actually use the study information.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:countrym361@aol.com">countrym361@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>Use the Peerless study you have and look at the ‘highly susceptible’ facts Concern / Claritying contamination. Have the tile improvements been taken into consideration with the farmland? What is the backup plan if the Aquifer is contaminated? What is the impact of existing businesses if the farmland crops are taken away? The Ethanol plant? Zahl’s Elevator? Helena Chemical? Gavilon Grainery? The jobs of the farmers? Both owners and their employees?</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:countrym361@aol.com">countrym361@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>In thinking about our future generations, think about our future generations need of clean air, clean water, and food, to mention a few things.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Countrym361@aol.com">Countrym361@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>No, the desired outcome for Our local New Carlisle Community is to Not have any further development of Industrial type. Principles to be considered are the opinions of those who live in this community.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Countrym361@aol.com">Countrym361@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>Try using the ‘strategy’ of actually listening and following what the New Carlisle Community wants, for No further Industrial development in or around our community. Not all citizens use the internet, asking for feedback by this means is wrong. Collecting information and doing only that, (collecting) and not actually using it is the same as not asking at all.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:country361@aol.com">country361@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback,</td>
<td>The entire area has been given public input, I have not heard one person living in this area speak in favor of it. Only those who live in this community agree.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Countrym361@icloud.com">Countrym361@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>No. Bill S. Has constantly changed the number of acreage to suit which ever audience he's speaking to. If it's prospective businesses, it's 22,000 acres. After citizens spoke against the high acreage, Bill S. Quotes anywhere from 2,200 to 7,000 acres.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Countrym361@icloud.com">Countrym361@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>No. Bill S. Has constantly changed the number of acreage to suit which ever audience he's speaking to. If it's prospective businesses, it's 22,000 acres. After citizens spoke against the high acreage, Bill S. Quotes anywhere from 2,200 to 7,000 acres.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Countrym361@icloud.com">Countrym361@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>There are advantages to having farms/crops in our area.</td>
<td>There are advantages to having farms/crops in our area. Having Fields of corn are an advantageous thing in our community, as corn plants are one of the best plants for cleaning and purifying the air, so, yes, the advantages of the more corn the better should have been included.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Countrym361@icloud.com">Countrym361@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>The Peerless water study shows the Aquifer is susceptible and or highly susceptible to contamination, looks like that was left out of the report...</td>
<td>The Peerless water study shows the Aquifer is susceptible and or highly susceptible to contamination, looks like that was left out of the report...</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Countrym361@icloud.com">Countrym361@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>There are already green spaces, nature areas, and parks here. You can’t make an industrial area nice just by sticking a bike path next to it, lipstick on a pig...plus there’s already been numerous organized bike rides through our area for many years, but I don’t see those continuing with all of the extra semi traffic the IEC would bring.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Countrym361@icloud.com">Countrym361@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>Leave it alone, if they want to redevelop an area, consider the Lincolnway West corridor from the airport to DTSB, there’s numerous boarded up empty businesses, THAT is what possible new business owners and visitors see when they are arriving from the airport, it’s an awful first impression, fix ALL of that first.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Countrym361@icloud.com">Countrym361@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>No. The citizens whose addresses contain “New Carlisle” should have final consideration as to whether or not the IEC is allowed at all, and to what extent.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Countrym361@icloud.com">Countrym361@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>There is no confusion to the fact that the greater majority of New Carlisle residents may have been allowed to speak, but we clearly are not being heard, or having our wants for OUR neighborhood actually put into the project. Clearly we are allowed to speak, but clearly our voices are NOT part of the IEC plans.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:daniel.caruso54@gmail.com">daniel.caruso54@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>How can we know whether this Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local community when the local community has not been involved in the process?</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:daniel.caruso54@gmail.com">daniel.caruso54@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>Solar and wind collection facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:daniel.caruso54@gmail.com">daniel.caruso54@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>As a resident of New Carlisle who has been deeply involved in this discussion for almost 2 years. I can state, without any reservation that other than a meeting in New Carlisle in June of 2018, there have been no - zero public meetings or workshops seeking public input. Regularly scheduled monthly meetings are not proper times or venues for these workshops or discussions.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:daniel.caruso54@gmail.com">daniel.caruso54@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>The interests of the citizens of New Carlisle and Olive Township need to be fairly represented by the New Carlisle Town Council and the Olive Township Board of Trustees. These bodies should have input which is no less in value than any member of the South Bend Chamber of Commerce, the Redevelopment Commission, the Board of Commissioners, the County Council or the Economic Development Office of St. Joseph County.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:danilemartens@gmail.com">danilemartens@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/20/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>The plan gives lip service to the environment and to community needs, but very little real strategy for either. What there is, is window dressing that won't hide the megaplex. The county should give due diligence to considering what is needed here in light of its previous planning. The ninth largest megaplex in the country is not a desirable development for this county.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:danilemartens@gmail.com">danilemartens@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/20/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Natural gas extraction releases methane and is not sustainable.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:danilemartens@gmail.com">danilemartens@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/20/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>There has been little thought given to water air and soil conservation in this plan as exemplified by ignoring the county's recommendations and by siting a natural gas plant here. As well the water table is too high for industrial development and the New Carlisle town council voted against this development.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:danilemartens@gmail.com">danilemartens@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/20/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>The area slated for the ninth largest industrial megaplex in the country is far bigger that the county's plan. The plan allows 2000 acres for development and this is 7200.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:debradurall@gmail.com">debradurall@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>I have not been able to find/access the appendixes. Are they identified as such in this Direct Feedback?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:debradurall@gmail.com">debradurall@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>I was not able to access Appendix D to review the Archeological sites listing. The absence of these Appendices was noted publicly before the pandemic shut-down, and was not answered. At this point, acknowledging the absence, with an explanation and follow-up provision, is appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:debradurall@gmail.com">debradurall@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>I. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>1) All of the Appendixes need to be posted and included in the hard copies, to allow public to factor and comment on the specific backup information to the positions the IEC has taken based on that information. Since they are referenced by this Direct Feedback, and the time to read, process, and comment is excessive, they should have been included from the first. Late inclusion of this supporting Direct Feedbackation presents a hurdle for informed public input, and thus for the IEC plan. For instance the formula being used for calculating the Safe Yield for the Aquifers has not been shared, and has been requested multiple times; that formula might make a significant difference in that withdrawal safety, and both experts and residents are Concern / Clarityed.</td>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:debradurall@gmail.com">debradurall@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>II. Are the Boundaries clear and concise? How would you approach discussion of these areas to further inform those not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>The boundaries are clear and concise on the map included in Fig. 1.4. There have been many IEC Direct Feedbacks produced by the IEC team, with varying acreages, and it is good to have this Direct Feedback to clarify and move forward with these acreages, to understand the project as it now stands. A discussion about the acreages would include the prior sentence, as well as the IEC Master Plan statement that this is a living Direct Feedback, so there could be further changes in those boundaries. The working definition of Boundaries is of central importance to the public, as these terms are too changeable to be reliable in the cultural sense. Please define your use of boundaries with regard to the TIF areas, the Economic Development Area and the IEC. How long will these boundaries be respected? I think that an intention to expand the New Carlisle EDA to match the Core Development Area and beyond, or any further changes, without transparently and publicly posting that plan, would harm any progress the IEC team has achieved with this Direct Feedback. Even when the frog is nearly boiled and it is too late, it knows something is not right. These types of actions in the past have contributed to some of the current mistrust.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:debradurall@gmail.com">debradurall@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>II. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>Full disclosure about why the existing developments have not fulfilled their promise, and why some of the businesses in the IEC area have not been held to their promises, and mechanisms in place to prevent those things from happening again, are the minimum required. A plan to fill those existing developments first, as good economic strategy for the area, regardless of the tax base and TIF boundaries, would make good logical and accountability/trust sense to residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:debradurall@gmail.com">debradurall@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>II. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>Funding for these developments and surrounding infrastructure should come from the TIF areas, and not by expanding the boundaries of the TIF or Economic Development areas further. Development that has the TIF to fund it, should prevent the residents from bearing the burden for economic development maintenance and mistakes. There is general exhausted malaise and mistrust of SJC through not being able to let down our guard. It all needs to be above board from initial concept to consequences, BECAUSE SO MUCH IS AT STAKE.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| debradurall@gmail.com | 4/26/2020 | III. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area? | 1) I see it as one of the most risky and difficult endeavors we undertake. Its very common to sell a plan on paper successfully, that does not take into account the added dimension of risks in this IEC area over even other development areas. I see many well envisioned and financed businesses that fail in more easily developed and trafficked areas. In general, we are in a new time of collective import and risk. 
   a. We must do everything deeper and differently including asking the hard questions of: who really needs this and why? 
   b. What are we sacrificing for this risk, and is it justified? 
   c. Who picks up the pieces of a development gone wrong or empty? 
   d. Until those questions are answered, we can make bigger mistakes in a time when we cannot really make any more. This combination of perfection and risk does not seem possible, based on our track record.  
2) Regarding jobs, see Chapter 4.I comments. | Concern / Clarity | 5       |
<p>| <a href="mailto:debradurall@gmail.com">debradurall@gmail.com</a> | 4/26/2020 | I. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or business to highlight? | Yes, the businesses downtown and the farmers who are contributing to tax base should be listed as businesses. | Direct Feedback   | 2       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| debradurall@gmail.com | 4/26/2020 | 1) Is this Direct Feedback being called the IEC Master Plan Draft, or the IEC Area Management Plan? It seems I have seen both titles – is the Direct Feedback online being altered since initial posting?  
2) The rankings in Fig. 2.10 are favorable to manufacturing, etc., but what about the people and other soft bodied things? I notice that Indiana in general ranks 41 for longevity and health, due to high rate of air pollution in recent years. That will affect both IEC employers and employees. |                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Direct Feedback | 2       |
<p>| <a href="mailto:debradurall@gmail.com">debradurall@gmail.com</a> | 4/26/2020 | I. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area? | Expanding on environmental/agriculture/food/health/fitness should always be an implicit pillar in any development today. Environmental and health businesses, such as native planting nurseries, hospital and medical and retreat facilities within the natural and green agricultural aspect would work well with wetland/woods and active transportation and recreational opportunities. Especially near Bendix Woods. This is an opportunity that would build on South Bend Medical and Restaurant businesses, as well as Lake Michigan recreation income and blend with rural character of quiet AND integrate deeply the sustainability intention through clean air initiatives. It would also provide green corridor and flyway from Spicer Lake to wetlands and Kankakee River. However, this would have to include expanding buffers beyond the current vision, to support clean air and diversity more than landscaping along roads, etc., can accomplish. | Direct Feedback | 4       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:debradurall@gmail.com">debradurall@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1) The strategies are identified as including the 5 noted; are there others not noted that are being used? 2) The bullet point in the Agribusiness portion about reducing sprawl on page 75 to concentrate Priority Growth Zone, Hamilton Grove, and other infill locations within the IEC... Since this is not in the IEC core, it is not this is not clear to me as to whether these are being considered as annexed to the IEC, and where the boundaries of the Priority Growth Zone as well as infill areas are established or identified in the Direct Feedback. Please clarify. 3) Concept A (20 &amp; Smilax) includes bike trail along the Taylor Ditch in a flood zone and as a result would require significant construction and maintenance to keep it open and traversible. Also the location near a road and industry would require significant buffering from particulates to prevent lung disease increases. 4) Concept A; The New Carlisle Town Masterplan has been updated to include the 2020 Moratorium resolution on further industrial development unless in line with the 2002 Comprehensive Plan, and is consistently not cited in this Direct Feedback. 5) Concept A; Please define Preservation of Agricultural Land for the purposes of this Direct Feedback and Plan; what specific actions does this include or prevent? 6) Where is the North/South corridor to the Toll Road shown on a map in this Direct Feedback? 7) Concept B (Edison &amp; Early, N ditch/Walnut?); Please describe how a bike trail along the Niespodiany Ditch in the Flood zone would be constructed, buffered from industrial and...</td>
<td>Direct Feedback 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:debradurall@gmail.com">debradurall@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>II. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area?</td>
<td>It would be good to see the number or acres that are ready for development that are farm acres, as well as acres that are occupied by bodies of water and aquifer, woods and wetland, as these assets are critical to the well-being and resilience, and would be appropriate to maintain for those businesses that wish to participate in benefiting the community and workplace. Distance to the various bodies of water and the aquifer location bear noting as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| debradurall@gmail.com  | 4/26/2020  | I. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? | 1) The soil types that do not support development/construction have not been adequately explored and illustrated for the public. That information Direct Feedbacked in the 2002 Comprehensive Plan, and on many soil and water maps, readily available, but most public and maybe even potential industries may not be aware of the problems there.  
2) Maps show the conservation and wetlands along Edison and West of Walnut, that flow into the Niespodzany Ditch and down around Strawberry Road, where FEMA flooding areas are noted. IDEM Direct Feedbacks indicated that Nditch is already at capacity, before the Energy Center Phase II is discharging; how will the additional water affect the already sodden soil in that area and how will business manage that? Since the wetlands are conservation areas, as an aspect of keeping our water resources clean and healthy, doesn’t the fact that they mix with the discharge into the Nditch, and eventually into the Kankakee River, affect the ecosystem balance? Although IDEM lowered the standards for the St Joseph Energy Center discharge, siting public benefit does this mean we can keep lowering quality standards and further affect the system? Where does the line get drawn?  
3) Also, the controversial aspect of moving the ditches is obviously not being noted or addressed in this Direct Feedback. Moving the Nditch when the wetlands directly flow into it, is not advisable.  
4) Maps show that outside the core development area, from around Darden Road, the Geyer Ditch runs south just East of | Environmental      | 3        |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:debradurall@gmail.com">debradurall@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>II. Are there additional existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>What are the related medical costs for high traffic areas and factories? What are the recommendations for outdoor activity in high traffic zones? While MACOG and other indexes indicate that air quality is within attainment currently, this does vary significantly daily and seasonally, and with the DOUBLE TRUCK TRAFFIC compared to Centerpoint already, what will happen to our air quality with an increase in this traffic? These winds are prevailing from West, and bring this pollution right into the more populated urban areas around South Bend. While St. Joseph County is doing well with providing opportunities for outdoor enjoyment, the coupling of this with increased air pollution is non-sensical. Many people are headed outdoors right now, and being exposed to the pollutants while a virus threatens our ability to breathe. As a healthy person with a personal and family history of frequent asthma, I equate this to breathing second hand smoke. These are just some of the ways that the IEC is a misfit for this time of increasing environmental and social challenges.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <a href="mailto:debradurall@gmail.com">debradurall@gmail.com</a> | 4/26/2020 | I. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why? | 2) Also, the capacity of the Niespodziany Ditch to carry further discharge from industry is controversial, as apparently IDEM stated that it was already at capacity from St. Joseph Energy Center Place I. How these environmental and clean water decisions are being made with this Direct Feedback, and going forward, has not been shared with the public, and are central to Concern / Claritys. | Environmental | 5       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:debradurall@gmail.com">debradurall@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>II. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>No SJC has not taken the necessary precautions, and due diligence has not adequately researched the significance of the environmental challenges to local food production, soil and water resources, and the overall effect that more development would have on those critical underpinnings to the guiding principles stated and restated in this Direct Feedback, not only for the IEC but the surrounding areas as well. Even the basic goal of economic stability has not been addressed, since many of the business developments in SJC especially between South Bend and New Carlisle, have not succeeded in spite of spending excesses.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:debradurall@gmail.com">debradurall@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/20</td>
<td>I. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>I. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered? The Vision Statement should reference the implementation of recommendations that align with the 2002 Comprehensive Plan, and the 2020 updated Comprehensive Plan when it is completed, as well as the following guiding principles. 1) Strong Economy Principle. In what “way” will the IEC strengthen the region’s natural and cultural assets? Please identify specifically which of these assets will be strengthened; how does “strong” and “strengthen” translate to something tangible? These are favorably descriptive terms that mean very little without specifics. Please explain how investment in the IEC will expand our wilderness, wetlands and farmland that are necessary to re-establish a balance in our vital resources. Additionally, as E.F. Schumacher points out, there are many activities that we undertake that are uneconomic, that have value in themselves; such as cleanliness and washing. Beyond hygiene, cleanliness is seen as value in itself, it takes time and money and produces nothing except cleanliness; not everything falls under a production or consumption calculus. Often, what we can afford as producers, is very different than what we can afford as consumers. Production/Consumption, as a means to an end, is not the primary nature of land, it is secondary – land is meta-economic, which means it is in a sense, sacred, while it is also tangible. Man has not made the land, and cannot remake it once it is spoilt; it is not strictly utilitarian, and we do not have the right</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:debradurall@gmail.com">debradurall@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/20</td>
<td>I. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>The buffer zones and green areas need to be commented on by those who will be most likely to use them, such as biking groups, runners, and walkers. We have experience with many kinds of those trails, and lots of them are just a pretty frame for development, but with priority attention, can be of real benefit. The success or failure of the IEC and its effect on St. Joseph County residents depends largely on this aspect.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:debradurall@gmail.com">debradurall@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>III. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>Much of my response to this question is already covered in Principle 6, and Additional principles comments. However, notable is the introductory statement to this Direct Feedback that the IEC “is one of the nations’s best kept development secrets”… “steadily expanding”… The public agrees that this process has not been clear and transparent. I personally have noted the lack of meetings where an exchange of information was conducted, aside from the public hearings, and an early APRA request Direct Feedbacked the IEC team’s frustration with being able to manage the public response while still moving the project forward, so the decision was made to “go silent”. Perhaps it is naive and futile to make this point, but in respecting this public comment period, I feel obligated to point out that information gathering is an objective activity – it cannot have the outcome determined and preplanned; otherwise they are not gathering information, they are managing information. Information gathering must be done by a third party that is not personally invested in the outcome. This does not include the Big Idea comments that went far beyond an objective or professional approach, even while using that paid platform, or County employees. While the public is often clearly making emotional statements, and not experts, the paid “professionals”” should be expected to be objective with information gathering and processing. This Direct Feedback is a start, but as you see, the questions are generally broad, and overlapping. For those of us who care enough about the significant effects, they are difficult to address efficiently. The IEC expects to create an...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dewayne Dolph</td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>The IEC would be bad for New Carlisle turning valuable prime tillable farm land into a huge industrial complex. It should be built in an area already used for industry or non tillable land. Since farm land can never be reclaimed once the top soil is gone. Another issue is the depleting of the aquifer. It could be depleted in a relatively short time and scientist have studied other depleted aquifers and concluded that it took thousands of years for the earth to create them and once it’s gone it’s gone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:DeweyDolph@gmail.com">DeweyDolph@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/14/2020</td>
<td>Keep area zoning for farming only. There is too much industry development already.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:DeweyDolph@gmail.com">DeweyDolph@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/14/2020</td>
<td>Keep area zoning for farming only. That is why we live in the area.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:DeweyDolph@gmail.com">DeweyDolph@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/14/2020</td>
<td>Keep zoning for farming only. That is why we live in the area.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:DeweyDolph@gmail.com">DeweyDolph@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/14/2020</td>
<td>Area taxes should not go for more development or business subsidy.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:DeweyDolph@gmail.com">DeweyDolph@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/14/2020</td>
<td>Yes. People like me who live in the area do not want this plan. New factories should replace old factory areas in South Bend.</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:DeweyDolph@gmail.com">DeweyDolph@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/14/2020</td>
<td>Keep the area zoned for farming only. We already have our fair share of factories. Redevelop old unused factory areas in South Bend with new industry.</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:DeweyDolph@gmail.com">DeweyDolph@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/14/2020</td>
<td>The town of New Carlisle and Olive trustees voted to stop this plan. Take the hint - we who live here do not want it! It is ridiculous in size and ruins what is good about the area.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:DeweyDolph@gmail.com">DeweyDolph@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/14/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>Well advertised public meetings held in New Carlisle BEFORE developing plan and buying land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dnarvaez@nd.edu">dnarvaez@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>Yes, stop this plan. There is no way to be sensitive enough, except to withdraw the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dnarvaez@nd.edu">dnarvaez@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>I would tell them it is a bad idea --bad for the environment, bad for those who need jobs close to home, bad use of taxpayer funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dnarvaez@nd.edu">dnarvaez@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Green manufacturing within the cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dnarvaez@nd.edu">dnarvaez@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>Yes, it is a sensitive environmental area that should not be developed. We need to be more nature-minded these days as deforestation and other environmentally destructive practices have led to viruses crossing species, like COVID19. Why continue to be shortsighted, and dare I say it, stupid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dnarvaez@nd.edu">dnarvaez@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>The damage that will be done to the water table, local wildlife, and human health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dnarvaez@nd.edu">dnarvaez@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>Yes, it is a sensitive environmental area that should not be developed. We need to be more nature-minded these days as deforestation and other environmentally destructive practices have led to viruses crossing species, like COVID19. Why continue to be shortsighted, and dare I say it, stupid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dnarvaez@nd.edu">dnarvaez@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>The basic assumptions that IEC outside of SB and Elkhart or other areas previous industrialized should be overthrown. We are in the 21st century, not the 19th. Anyone reading the reports from every area of the world about human damage to ecologies, should be sensitive to not causing more harm but instead restoring and reconstituting local flora and fauna, keeping industrialization away so they can flourish. This plan has no sense of the wider picture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dnarvaez@nd.edu">dnarvaez@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>Yes, all the brown zones within cities should be developed instead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dnarvaez@nd.edu">dnarvaez@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>No. Why didn’t you spend time working out plans like these for places WITHIN SJC’s cities, where there is a lot of unused, formerly industrial, space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dnarvaez@nd.edu">dnarvaez@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>Move it all back to the cities, South Bend, Elkhart. Be smart developers, NOT following the damaging practices of the last century. This is the 21st century and we need to not harm the environment anymore, but restore its ecological balance, wherever we live. This plan does NOT do that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dnarvaez@nd.edu">dnarvaez@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>No. Step back and find other locations, already industrialized, closer to citizens who will work there. Don't add more to pollution and environmental disruption. And don't spend our hardearned money on such pie-in-the-sky destructive ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dnarvaez@nd.edu">dnarvaez@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>The plan was often secretive and shaped by personal interests of the developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:emeraldchoir@comcast.net">emeraldchoir@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>A vibrant and livable community. If this planning Direct Feedback is for people of the area we already know that’s what we have and we want to protect it. If this planning Direct Feedback is for potential manufacturing and transport business, I think they need to be made aware of the level of community outrage about this project and how it was developed.</td>
<td>I will answer this question the way I have noted some things above. There has been no benefit analysis of the productive farmland in a productive town in the productiveness of this area of the county. There has been no valuation of the actual need in this area of the county for this project. There’s been no evaluation of financial need by other areas in the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:emeraldchoir@comcast.net">emeraldchoir@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:emeraldchoir@comcast.net">emeraldchoir@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>102,000 acres that is the ultimate goal. There is no discussion of what industry would come what businesses would come with impact would be to businesses already in new Carlisle Farms already in new Carlisle existing enterprises throughout the area there is no cost benefit analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:emeraldchoir@comcast.net">emeraldchoir@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Agribusiness? Well that was a late addition to the plan. Have you explored what other counties have been doing in terms of agribusiness like The Fort Wayne area and Kosciusko County? The actual consultation of and inclusion of agricultural businesses and in consultation with area universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:emeraldchoir@comcast.net">emeraldchoir@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>Well these are two very different questions lumped into one. I’ll just say for the first question in terms of future growth and development getting the area prepared for same, I think the best thing would be to improve our education structure improve educational opportunities from K through 12 and vocational training. The area needs an educated and employable workforce. But this isn’t what you are looking for. Now is it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:emeraldchoir@comcast.net">emeraldchoir@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>Yes quite simply all the other acreage all the comprehensive acreage that is now under production as farmland, some small ranching activities, and some acreage left fallow for environmental purposes. All of this exists now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:emeraldchoir@comcast.net">emeraldchoir@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>I haven’t mentioned this yet but of prime importance is protect the aquifer. Protect the aquifer. Protect the aquifer. Protect the aquifer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:emeraldchoir@comcast.net">emeraldchoir@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>At least you’re being specific on this request in terms of figured 2.14. Listing agricultural setting as an asset and listing community cohesion as an asset is almost offensive. Community cohesion? Your group your county representatives in terms of Mr. Schalliol the Intero group and big idea could not even get cohesive enough to have more than one meeting in New Carlisle to this whole process.</td>
<td>Representation 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:emeraldchoir@comcast.net">emeraldchoir@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>Again, it’s not my job to do your job for you. If you want to consider development constraints why don’t you note the degree and level of opposition to the IEC. If that is not a constraint I don’t know what is. Have you surveyed the landowners yourself? Do you have property owners willing to sell? Can you list them? do you have property owners that are not willing to sell, can you list them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:emeraldchoir@comcast.net">emeraldchoir@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>First of all there were not enough meetings. The spring meeting that was supposed to be held in New Carlisle as far as I am aware did not occur. The presentation by Mr. Schalliol to the county was done way too late in the process. Public comment was not allowed at that presentation. The further presentation that included Lou Pierce again did not allow public comment. In addition it was an embarrassment in terms of content and in terms of believing that you on the Council and then us as citizens are stupid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:emeraldchoir@comcast.net">emeraldchoir@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>The whole thing needs more public input. There’s been no publication there has been no presentation there’s been no description there is been no defense of why this is necessary. Why? Why? Why? I am glad this is just a draft. It needs to be thoroughly reworked. It needs to be done by the area plan commission not the redevelopment commission, without any council member guidance. Simply 2-1 commissioner rubber stamping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:emeraldchoir@comcast.net">emeraldchoir@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>I can’t believe that hundreds of thousands of dollars were spent to produce this report. And yet only one public meeting in the summer of 2018. New Carlisle residents are not rubes. If anything comes of this please advise Mr. Schalliol to not repeat a story about a woman saying that high speed Internet is going to bring porn and divorce to the area. That may in fact have been true but it is not representative and it only shows his disdain for the residents of this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:fmcguire@att.net">fmcguire@att.net</a></td>
<td>2/26/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rather than destroy usable farm land in New Carlisle, IN, why not carve acreage out from the vacant land on the west side of South Bend where such land is in abundance. As an added benefit, the South Bend locations already have gas, electric, sewer and railway connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| gkesslerotr@peoplepc.com | 4/26/2020 | >-When researching some Olive Township history, I found a statement that said that there was jealousy re: Olive township in its early history re: the wealth it contained in farmland, forests, etc. Olive Township is also only given one vote on the County Council and so has little opportunity to fight invasions such as IEC into Olive Township.  
>-I suppose none of the Council members remember the dust bowl of the 1930's which devastated immense agricultural areas and their ability to provide crops. With climate change a prospect, I wonder about the wisdom of turning bountiful farmland into paved parking lots and factories. Since the year I graduated high school in 1963 the U.S. population has gone from 150 million to 350 million. We need an agricultural economy to provide for our people as well as an industrial one. It is short sighted to think that agriculture and green spaces don't matter.  
>-In the late 1980s, in the town of New Carlisle, reporters on the streets surprised residents by asking their opinions of the fact that New Carlisle was on the list of the top ten percent of towns in Indiana with the highest cancer rates. Increasing factory emissions into the atmosphere and water in the Olive Township area certainly has the potential to increase that rate as we see the current federal administration de-emphasizing regulations that would protect the environment.  
>-I urge the stoppage of plans to increase the area of current industrialization to monster proportions.  
>-I also would like to point out that the winds in this area tend to blow easterly toward South Bend and also that, after looking at federal maps of waterways, have learned that not... | Concern / Clarity |         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:gkesslerotr@peoplepc.com">gkesslerotr@peoplepc.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>When researching some Olive Township history, I found a statement that said that there was jealousy re: Olive township in its early history re: the wealth it contained in farmland, forests, etc. Olive Township is also only given one vote on the County Council and so has little opportunity to fight invasions such as IEC into Olive Township. I suppose none of the Council members remember the dust bowl of the 1930's which devastated immense agricultural areas and their ability to provide crops. With climate change a prospect, I wonder about the wisdom of turning bountiful farmland into paved parking lots and factories. Since the year I graduated high school in 1963 the U.S. population has gone from 150 million to 350 million. We need an agricultural economy to provide for our people as well as an industrial one. It is short sighted to think that agriculture and green spaces don't matter. In the late 1980s, in the town of New Carlisle, reporters on the streets surprised residents by asking their opinions of the fact that New Carlisle was on the list of the top ten percent of towns in Indiana with the highest cancer rates. Increasing factory emissions into the atmosphere and water in the Olive Township area certainly has the potential to increase that rate as we see the current federal administration de-emphasizing regulations that would protect the environment. I urge the stoppage of plans to increase the area of current industrialization to monster proportions. I also would like to point out that the winds in this area tend to blow easterly toward South Bend and also that, after looking at federal maps of waterways, have learned that not...</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:goats3@aol.com">goats3@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/12/2020</td>
<td>I am a property owner in the general area of the &quot;proposed' IEC. My family has farmed areas near this for years. This plan will cause the loss of prime farmland, which can never be replaced. It will also cause irreparable environmental issues. I also think the way the county leaders have been trying to &quot;sneak&quot; this in is wrong. Public input is hard to give, and they spin negative comments from opponents to look like the opponents favor this, when they do not. This whole plan should be forgotten.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:goats3@aol.com">goats3@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/12/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Town of New Carlisle voted against it, they do not want it, as do most of the local residents.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Henderson, 1355 W. Springville, La Porte, IN 46350-8344</td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>Has the IEC considered how to make the proposed development carbon-neutral? As the dire effects of climate change become increasingly apparent worldwide, it would be responsible to take time to consider this, as part of IEC’s stated interest in “sustainable prosperity.”</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Henderson, 1355 W. Springville, La Porte, IN 46350-8345</td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>Has the IEC considered whether any proposed industrial developments might be better located in South Bend brownfields rather than productive rural greenfields?</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Henderson, 1355 W. Springville, La Porte, IN 46350-8346</td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>If the IEC develops as planned, it seems inevitable that both traffic and population will increase. What specific plans has IEC developed to strictly limit these changes? Such plans are mentioned only briefly and vaguely, but there is plenty said about specific new roads, new rights-of-way, and perhaps even a new interchange with the Toll Road (chapter 4, page 92).</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Henderson, 1355 W. Springville, La Porte, IN 46350-8347</td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Will IEC offer incentives (such as tax breaks) for new businesses coming in? If so, has IEC planned how to deal with businesses that choose to leave once their incentives expire? Many places with more clout than northern Indiana have been victimized by this business practice.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Henderson, 1355 W. Springville, La Porte, IN 46350-8348</td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>What if anything does it mean to say that natural areas in the IEC will be connected and maintained, &quot;where possible&quot; (ch 3 pg 62)</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Henderson, 1355 W..</td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Broadband internet is mentioned twice in chapter 3, figure 3.13 states that it is only for business. Is this correct?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springville, La Porte, IN 46350-8349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Increased traffic has already caused issues for the county in the New Carlisle area. New Prairie high school students are no longer able to exit the school via State Road 2, because of increased truck traffic likely from the toll road and the risk of safety. What will further increased traffic do to the area and how big of a threat does it pose to the residents?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>The county should be focusing on jobs that are sustainable and looking towards the future, not necessarily what is popular or trending now. 30 years ago, IN TEK/KOTE was the latest and greatest industry that came to the area. Now, every 3-4 years the employees wonder if another contract will be signed and if they will have jobs. Several years ago, the deliberations went so far and other steel mill plants of Arcelor Mittal in the South started shutting down. It wasn’t until equipment was failing because workers were leaving (blast furnaces and others that must be kept running or shut down over days to properly cool), that the company and owner agreed to sign another contract. Industrial businesses have a place, but they certainly are not the future nor are they sustainable. The County should be focusing on agriculture first and foremost, highlight what this region has, and that is good fertile soil.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>The plan states that agribusiness is important to our area. However, it does not mention how the IEC will support agribusiness or help preserve farmland. Farmland is not easily come by these days, when a piece of property goes up for sale or for rent, it most often is quickly purchased or a bidding war ensues because farm ground is precious. And I mean that in the way that farms must have a sufficient amount of acreage to keep their farms running with income coming in every year. Once ground is paved over, it cannot be undone. Also, in our current predicament with COVID-19, many business are shut down or have talked about furloughs and involuntary layoffs. Such industrial businesses like IN TEK/KOTE being one of them. However, if you look out and around in the country you'll notice that the farmers are still farming. Why? Because it is essential and we need farms to survive. I think now more than ever people are starting to think about where their food comes from, and if we use up that ground for development that isn't sustainable and necessary to the functions of life, we make a huge mistake.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>I also believe that if the Development office invested half of the money in supporting agriculture or agribusiness, small urban growers, etc., that they have in &quot;planning&quot; for the IEC, that the constituents of the county would be much happier and would feel that taxpayer money was being spent on something good that could directly impact them in a meaningful way. Again, I mention COVID-19 because right now people are worried that they won't be able to fulfill their grocery lists and put local safe and clean food on the table. Our farmers are important and we should focus on supporting them instead of spending millions to &quot;plan&quot; for industries that may be obsolete.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>I believe that Agribusiness should be the first and primary focus for the area. Also, although the area has availability for other potential uses, by who and how will those changes be paid for?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region's characteristics?</td>
<td>I believe that growth for the county and focusing on bringing in new business could be a good thing, however, as I mentioned above I think it should be centered on what we already have here in the county, which is agriculture. We have prime farmland all around us, we should be thinking of ways to utilize those assets in a way that honors the region's characteristics as well as the wishes of the citizens of the county. Wouldn't it be wonderful to be the leading county in something that is sustainable and good... something that feeds people and helps our residents?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>They are clear on this plan, however, they completely ignore the 2002 Comprehensive Land Use Plan. And my first question would be to ask whomever I was talking to if they realized how big an acre was. My husband farms, and I'm always shocked to find out that one field is &quot;only 100 acres&quot; when it seems ginormous to me in size. I would HIGHLY encourage everyone to take a drive around the study, planning, and core development areas so that they can accurately get a picture of what 22,000 acres looks like.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>I believe the County should be focusing its efforts on revamping and restoring what it already has. Look at almost any area in South Bend, and there is room for improvement. Business like UniRoyal, South Bend Lathe, the Studebaker Site, etc., have infrastructure already in place. Why are these locations not being considered to revamp instead of utilizing good farm ground that HAS A PURPOSE. Also, business coming in most undoubtedly will want tax breaks and incentives. So who will be paying for those changes, the taxpayers who don’t want the IEC to begin with? How high will taxes go? These issues need to be considered.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>Yes, many of the soils in the Core Development area are considered Prime Soil/Prime Farmland. This should absolutely be taken into account when deciding the value of the land and comparing economic value and worth. Also, some of the soils, like those that are on Tamarack Road, are not conducive to building. The USGS website offers a host of information regarding soil types and their characteristics and many of the soils in this area are not great for building on, for wastewater treatment, or for other purposes. But, they are great for farmground. The water table is also high in many areas, and with flooding issues and recent years that have shown rainy spring seasons for farmers already, this could pose additional problems. Each acre of ground is precious and should be considered so.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>Yes, please see the note above about the USGS and soil data. Also, the information regarding the aquifer that has been acquired needs further clarification. The map image indicating the Aquifer System serving the IEC shows the entire 22,000 IEC “Planning Area” as the “Core Development Area”. This could be that this map was not updated when the plan was updated to the current 7,200 acre proposed Core Development Area. However, it appears that the aquifer numbers have NOT been updated. Therefore the information is a bit misleading/confusing. Also, the report states that the aquifer can support having water withdrawn at 49 mgd and that the industry that would be coming in would be utilizing 42.24 mgd. However, the report does not clarify if this level is sustainable long term or discuss how the aquifer recharges. What if it runs low? Who is allowed the usage of water? Citizens, businesses, agriculture?</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>Our water, air, and land of the county. Citizens of the county and of the Town of New Carlisle have spoken up time and time again that we are Concern / Clarityed about polluting our aquifer with industrial businesses, polluting our air, and ruining our land which cannot be undone. These natural assets must be considered heavily when making decisions regarding the county.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>The plan does not mention how increased traffic from industrial businesses would impact residents, the quality of life, and pollution levels. It's not a mystery that if their is more traffic, their undoubtedly will be more air, noise, and water pollution in the area.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>While the plan includes land conservation, it begs to look at the fact that its current use is already serving that purpose. Putting in bike trails around an industrial park won’t make it any less of an industrial park. Our county should be focusing efforts on increasing conservation in the area and promoting agribusiness and agriculture on all fronts, as they are sustainable. Now more than ever agriculture has made leaps and bounds towards sustainable practices. No till methods, organic farming, variable rate spreading for fertilizer, and soil sampling to determine exactly what a field needs. Investing in businesses that support these types of practices would show that the county is forward thinking and has Concern / Clarity and care for its constituents.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>I think that the County has not prepared the region for growth and development, again referencing the 2002 Comprehensive Land Use Plan. That plan, when drafted, stated that a minimum amount of acreage should be put to industrial use. If that idea has changed then the residents of the county deserve a fair chance to discuss and present a new plan, BEFORE any more money is spent on the IEC plan that may never come to fruition!</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>The vision statement does not mention that the original plan was for 22,000 acres from the development team, nor does it follow the 2002 Comprehensive Land Use Plan that stated that industrial development should not exceed 2,000 acres in that area. The local and regional community should have ample opportunity to provide input on a new Land Use Plan before moving forward with anything that contradicts the current plan. Also, yes other principles that should be considered are the longevity of such industrial businesses that may come in. For example, if the development team looks at industrial businesses that are in that area now like IN TEK/KOTE, and tracks its most recent history, the development team may find that those sorts of businesses may not be the best for the big picture or long term sustainability. Every 3-4 years IN TEK goes through a contract renewal and a few years ago, they almost did not renew their contract which would have led to the plant shutting down. If this happens, what happens to the building, the ground, and the surrounding area if another business doesn't want to come in? Farmland will always be needed, and will always be a necessity, once you remove it you can't get it back. The team should be focusing on businesses that promote sustainability, new technology, and ones that support the local and rural communities like agriculture, not smoke stack businesses that may be obsolete in 10 years leaving a scar on that chunk of ground that cannot be removed. In the Vision Statement the point of providing a &quot;Thriving Environment&quot; is also not realistic. If you place a bike trail next to an industrial park, it's still an industrial park. Right now our area in New Carlisle has multiple trails and places for...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>Absolutely. Specifically the size of the development areas, do we really want to be the 9th largest industrial mega-plex? Some development may be good, and I believe that some development could create wonderful opportunities for the county, but we really need to take a very specific look at what TYPE of development will lead us into the future. Also, who and how will projects be paid for, and what about the money that has already been spent? We should focus on the 2002 Comprehensive Land Use Plan and work on getting an updated version of that plan before moving forward. Lastly, I would specifically be interested in HOW farmland will be preserved and how our environment will be directly impacted, as there are still many many questions about the aquifer and pollution.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>Hold more public meetings, have the Development office list the meetings it has had in the past with members in attendance to help clear up any &quot;confusion&quot; over public input that was apparently given, work towards a new Comprehensive Land Use Plan utilizing residents' Concern / Claritys and opinions.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>I don't believe we need to be the 9th largest mega-industrial park to make an impression for our state. I think we need forward thinking and different avenues that can carry us into the future. My suggestion would be to talk to young farmers who will be working the land in coming years, ones that have been to college and have degrees in Soil Science, Agronomy, and Agribusiness. See what they think and what they can come up with, you may be surprised.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.albertson@valpo.edu">heather.albertson@valpo.edu</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>This question is laughable, which is unfortunate. There have only been one or two public meetings held in New Carlisle I believe to gain input from the public, and they were more presentations with a lecture style, not conducive to feedback from the constituents they were serving. There also was a &quot;steering committee&quot; however, it was discovered that several groups and names were placed on the list of those involved in the &quot;planning&quot;, who in reality had not been involved at all. As you can see that would lead to some confusion all right. This is the first real opportunity that we have had for public input, in my opinion, minus the occasions where groups show up to the County meetings to voice their opinions on their own in hopes that the governing bodies will listen. If there have been more meetings, we haven't known about them. I think the Development Office should procure a list of dates and specific meetings held with the members in attendance, and then maybe that would help clear up the confusion, as I don't recall Community Workshops or Public Comment Meetings.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heschcarol@sbcglobal.net">heschcarol@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>We. DONT WANT SMOKESTACK BUSINESSES. YOU GUYS SCREWED US WOHT THE SHREDDER.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:heschcarol@sbcglobal.net">heschcarol@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>You will RUIN our farmland, beauty, ecosystems and aquifer. You have ALREADY DESTROYED THE WOODS EAST OF BENDIX WOODS. UGH. HEARTBREAKING.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Table of Contents – None of the Appendices are in the copy of the Draft Plan issued by the Dept Of Infrastructure ...... 2 25 20. Without the appendix, some of the statements made through the report cannot be adequately evaluated.</td>
<td>Appendicies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>This area should stay in farming. It is not fair to favor one business (industry) over an existing family owned business (farming). In Indiana 4 out of 10 jobs are agriculturally related. Fill in vacant areas of other existing industrial parks in St Joseph County, redevelop existing brownfields with new industrial development, work regionally with LaPorte County on Kingsbury Industrial site.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>This area should stay in farming. It is not fair to favor one business (industry) over an existing family owned business (farming). In Indiana 4 out of 10 jobs are agriculturally related. Fill in vacant areas of other existing industrial parks in St Joseph County, redevelop existing brownfields with new industrial development, work regionally with LaPorte County on Kingsbury Industrial site.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>Pg 105 the 1st &amp; last parts of the 1st sentence – “Successful implementation of this plan will result in ....expanded tax base for St Joseph County &amp; New Carlisle communities. We have heard this story before and it was not fulfilled. In circa 1980s we in Olive Township were told that when IN/Tec's tax abatement and TIF fund ran its course, the taxes from that Economic Development area would create enough taxes into the local government that our property taxes would go down. The exact opposite happened. When the TIF fund ran it’s course, it was rolled over into the new IEC-TIF fund district until sometime in 2024.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>3. No clear answer here how That does not answer key priorities of preserving the county’s agricultural lands or small-town quality of life. Also, the 1.02% St Joseph County property tax is touted as below the national average but due to TIF the increase in assessed evaluation of industry does not pay into school &amp; local government, leaving any increases in services needs to be paid by the businesses and residences outside of the IEC.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>4. I question the assumption of the plan premise that this scale of development would be able to be achieved in both a positive manner and with good environmental impact. I do not have strong faith that this size development could occur responsibly at this scale – or that the County has the resources to enforce responsibility.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>At 7,200 acres, the IEC being proposed is said will be the 9th largest mega-site in the country. The planning group needs to study how a project of this scale impacts its surrounding areas with concentrated traffic, noise, pollution, water use, etc.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>5/1/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>At Lake’s grain elevator (now Gavilon), processing was limited to drying grain down to a moisture content to prevent mold during storage. The New Carlisle location of Carris Reels was established in 1970 = 50 years. Unifrax was 1976 = 44 years. Is that enough to be called a history of industrial development? And, if so, how would that be relevant to the areas south of the existing IN/Tek area development, which is all farm ground.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>5/2/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>I’m very Concern / Clarityed that all farm land is treated as a potential development place. Mr Schalliol &amp; Mr Rae of the Chamber of Commerce even joked about on and Economic Outlook TV show. Times have now changed, making the loss of farmland and wetlands more valuable than 1920, in light of climate and local food and water needs. Industry is not a solution to our problems when it is causing so many of them.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>5/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Also, it appears that the aquifer numbers have not been changed to reflect the change in acreage and since Appendix F was not provided, I can’t evaluate this matter. If the final proposed build out would presume to draw up to 42.24 million gallons a day from an aquifer system of 22,000 acres, according to the proposed map, that would be drastically different than 7,200 acres. Is the IEC plan is looking at its numbers appropriately, or are they considering a wider area to make the numbers look better for the report? What protection is there from industry mis-use?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>5/13/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>The mid ¶ sentence “Although the soils are variable, they are generally considered suitable for construction purposes with appropriate site preparation.” This means stripping the fertile agricultural soils rendering the area unsuitable for farming in the future.</td>
<td>Concern /</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>A parking lot for the redistribution of nations stuff. Smart logistics is fancy term for the warehousing of materials and goods to be distributed with the least amount of people labor. The next to last sentence “Improving multimodal access” sounds similar to Elwood Illinois fiasco import it of low wage workers and high volume of truck traffic with little benefit to the existing local community. There are numerous places in St Joseph County that have the same or better logistics and locational advantages as Olive Township and without a new South Shore Station or a connector railroad to the 7½ mile connection Canadian National Railroad. The Hudson Lake flag stop serves the New Carlisle &amp; Hudson Lake community well. If a new South Shore station were to be build to serve the New Carlisle community it should be built somewhere to the west of the US20 viaduct.</td>
<td>Concern /</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Acknowledging that the plan is conceptual &amp; schematic, any one of these purple boxes representing future industry could be constructed in numerous other sites within St Joseph County with just as good, if not better, business environment without running prime farm ground. Also, it is misleading to use symbols of grown woods where none exist now. If a buffer is proposed, specifics on the elements of the buffer ought to specified and be portrayed in a realistic manor.</td>
<td>Concern /</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Pg 13, 2ND Sentence – “….manufacturing,….” &amp; Page 14, CURRENT DEVELOPMENT 2nd sentence - Response = Should add “grain elevator &amp; grain storage, car &amp; scrap metal recycling, wooden wire reel recycling, packaging, concrete mixing “...and logistics. Management Plan writers cherry-pick only those industries that fit their agenda. That makes this Direct Feedback a Marketing Plan, not a Management Plan.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Pg 13, 2nd ¶, 1st sentence “Initial industrial development began …. With the opening of the Studebaker plant in 1926.” Response = It was not a “Plant”, it was a test track to drive vehicles on it.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Pg 16, last ¶, &amp; Figure 2.3 – “….agribusiness….” – None of the farming operations shown are planned to take place in the IEC by this Management Plan. This is a misrepresentation of these pages.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Pg, 18, 4th sentence – “Preserving the county’s agricultural lands... were key priorities....” – Response = How does taking 7,200 acres of farm land out of production preserve the county’s agricultural lands? How does one minimize impacts of industrial development growth by installing concrete foundations and asphalt paving in place, railroad spurs over wetlands? Once the topsoil is removed, the land will never be the same. Times have changed. Currently there is plenty of US agricultural production but production in the western states is based on irrigation and trucking. The western states are pumping their aquifers down while climate change is forecast to bring about more droughts and trucking produces lots of CO2s and air pollutants. Turning farm land into industrial use should not be considered lightly, as the impact on the land and the surrounding can last forever. The IEC Management plan does not indicate anything about how agricultural lands may be preserved. Future generations are going to need this prime farmland over such a great aquifer as the Kankakee. Yes, we should preserve farm land. Just saying so with such empty rhetoric does not make it happen.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Pg, 18, 1st ¶, space after the 2nd bullet point – A third bullet point is needed – Response = Farms in the IEC area.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Pg, 18, COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE 1st ¶, space after the 5th bullet point – A 6th bullet point is needed – Response = Farming over the great Kankakee aquifer that can be adapted to serve local markets without a lot of transportation cost and pollution.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Pg, 20, 3rd ¶, 3rd sentence “....compared to megasites in the 5 state region ....-the IEC has over twice as much trucking as freight as the nearest competitor.” Response = Really? Elwood Illinois has 25,000 trucks daily. And if we already have twice as much as that, why would we want any more?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>1st ¶, last sentence and 1st bullet point “IEC businesses benefit from direct access....” 1st bullet point “Indiana Toll Road” – Response = IEC does not have direct access to the Toll Rd. To have direct access the County would have to expand the IEC to the north half of the 22,000-acre planning area and build the connector access point.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Pg, 22, 2nd ¶, and 2nd bullet point – “Rail access opportunities abound within the IEC,...” 2nd bullet point “Canadian National Railway (CN) - Response = This is a misrepresentation that would be typical in a Marketing Plan, but should be more clear in a Management Plan. The IEC does not have direct access to the CN railway, it is 4 miles to the south of the southern most point of the IEC (this 4 miles is shown in Figure 2.8 but the text on Pg 22 is misleading). In order for the IEC to have access to the CN Railway the County would have to expand the IEC to the south half of the 22,000-acre planning area and build the connector access point. This would also involve a grade separation of SR2.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Pg, 25, 1st ¶, last sentence “Median property tax ....in St Joseph County....1.02%” – Response = This does not mention that the TIF area increment does not contribute to local taxes and therefore additional expense like the cumulative bridge fund shortfalls, 911 call centers, etc result in either raising taxes in all other county areas to the cap level, or reductions in governmental services.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Pg, 26, 1st ¶, last sentence “Appendix A... taxes” – Response = Appendix A is not provided, therefore can-not evaluate how it is, or isn’t relevant.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Pg 28, next to last sentence – “Celebrating, preserving, and protecting the community’s unique cultural and natural assets is a key priority of this plan. Response = I have been able to speak to many of my neighbors here in Olive Township and hear repeatedly of unbearable noise at times, explosions, air pollution, truck traffic, and air-born debris from the current industry in the IEC. Using these small-town assets as a simple sales tool without ensuring the quality of life preservation is trying to have it both ways for simple marketing goals.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Pg 33, 1st ¶, 3rd &amp; 4th sentences – “….existing conditions were utilized....., thereby minimizing impacts to the adjacent communities ....preservation and connection of substantial environmental and agricultural corridors, retaining character of the region.....” – Response = How does an industrial megaplex minimizing impacts, retaining character of the region? This is just more flowery language to justify destroying the environmental and agricultural character of the existing land in the IEC area.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/28/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Pg 34 Figure 3.1 Response = So the Planning Area &amp; the IEC/CDA already has a much higher % of Industrial than the rest of the county, so the Redevelopment Dept’s answer is to make it even more industrial and that will “minimize impacts to the adjacent communities ....preservation and connection of substantial environmental and agricultural corridors, retaining character of the region....”. This is makes no since.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/29/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Pg 37, 1st ¶, &amp; Figure 3.3 – “....Planning Area that includes a 22,000-acre geography.” Response = The Planning area is often referenced through this IEC Management Plan as 22,000-acres these pages reference the whole western part of St Joseph County &amp; eastern LaPorte Co as the Planning area. Which is it?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
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<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/30/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Pg 38, 3rd ¶, end of sentence “….history of industrial development.” Response = Industry is defined as - economic activity Concern / Clarified with the processing of raw materials and manufacture of goods. Studebaker proving grounds test tract (at what now is Navistar) was not industrial development they didn’t make anything there. But even if they did have some repair facilities there, it does not an industrial tradition make, no more than the machinery buildings on most of the farmsteads. The history of farming families in the area is a tradition.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>5/3/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Pg 39, Figure 3.5 – Response = The orange ovals on the 4 sides of the IEC on Figure 3.5 appear to be arbitrary in size. They are dreamed up constraints designed to box in the IEC area as the logical location. Additionally, why is Utility Corridors a constraint on industrial development? Utility Corridors are less of a constraint than railroads or mayor highways. Why is the farm land between the Guyer Ditch flood plain and the eastern edge of the IEC colored in by the orange oval?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>5/4/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Pg 40, 1st ¶ say’s “…..maintenance of the existing infrastructure has been a primary driver of this plan as current industrial uses challenge the existing roadways.” Response: How does adding more truck traffic with the development of the IEC improve that situation? The next sentence states “Maintaining and improving as efficient, safe, and multimodal transportation system is essential for the livability of the area.........” We all agree with “Maintaining” but how does adding more industrial traffic, “improving” the livability of the area?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>5/5/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Pg 40, Right side ¶ say’s that MACOG acting as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the area. Yet when I called MACOG in 2019 to ask about and updates to the 2002 St Joseph County Comprehensive Plan, they indicated that they did not have any information and I would have to call St Joseph County officials.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
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<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>5/6/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Pg 42, 2nd ¶, last sentence - “Increased levels of truck traffic along US 20 is a Concern / Clarity cited by residents and business owners.” Which is a true statement, but there is no mention of the fact that Indiana State Road 2 carries 70% as much traffic as the Toll Road and since they have raised the Toll Rd truck fees, truck traffic has increased to the point that it is very difficult and dangerous to access SR 2 from a side road. This has caused NP Schools to rule that the students could no longer use the SR 2 route when leaving school.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>5/7/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Pg 44 - Response = It is stated that the Canadian National Railway is only 3 miles away, but that is at the southeast corner of the “Core Area” where the CN runs at a diagonal to the IEC east/west axis. It is more than 7 ½ miles from the Northfolk Southern RR at the west side of the IEC and nearly 7 miles south of Edison Road where the current IN/Tec development area is located. Also the south 3½ miles are not in the current IEC Core Area and therefore it is disingenuous to claim that the CN is “serving” the IEC. Consequently, it is dishonest to contend that both the IEC Core Area is only 7,200 acres and that the CN is available to “serve” the IEC.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>5/8/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Pg 48 - There are no public sidewalks in, to, or around the IEC.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>5/9/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Pg 57, Figure 3.19 – The size of the core area is 22,000 acres. This appears to be a 2018 map when the Economic Development Department was calling that 22,000 acre area the core area. Now they claim the core area has always been 7,200-acres and the 22,000 area was only the study area. But on page 37 they reference the whole western part of St Joseph County &amp; eastern LaPorte Co as the Planning area. Which is it?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>5/11/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Pg 59, - Response = The part of the last sentence in this ¶ “….indicating that that the county anticipated industrial growth in the New Carlisle area” seems a real stretch. Since the Appendix G is not provided, it is not possible to evaluate this statement.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>5/12/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Pg 64 – Response = Since the groundwater is at 4 to 6 feet in depth, the “additional consideration” referenced in the 2nd sentence means dewatering pumps during construction. During construction of St Joseph Energy plant, the dewatering pumps were not turned off during high runoff rain events (as the were supposed to be by contract) resulting in flooding in the farm fields at the south end of the Niespodziany Ditch. The “additional consideration” also results in retention ponds setting in our aquifer with no clay layer for protection in most areas.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>5/14/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Pg 64 - Response = Even if all of the industry is cleaner than the existing, the increase truck traffic alone will increase deasil emissions.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>5/15/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Pg 69 - Response = The entire IEC plan runs counter to the next to last sentence “……ensure that future development in the IEC does not negatively impact the region’s unique agricultural character and natural environment.” It is a ludicrous and impossible to deliver such a statement by this plan.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>1st Question = No! It varies in the maps of some chapters. 2nd Question = I would recommend using more descriptive terms and using the same terms consistently throughout.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
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<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
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<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 1 – How can this plan claim to “….protect the character of the community and the agriculture resources throughout the area.” if the result is to move people out of their homes and replace farm ground with concrete, pavement, and retention ponds?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>- How can this plan seek to “balance these interests (agriculture &amp; community) in a way that maximizes the ability of each to thrive” when it proposes to almost eliminate most of the farm ground in the IEC area?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 2 – How can this plan claim to put S.B. Region “….on a path to towards sustainable….” by replacing carbon sequestrating farm crops and woods, and wetlands</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>- The plan is not a “comprehensive plan…..” because it does not address improving agriculture or sustainability in the IEC.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 3 – There are no “…appropriate locations…” beyond to original 2002 designated area.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>- How is the Plan going to “….minimize impacts….” on agriculture lands by development of industrial areas on farm ground.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>- Just curious, who were the “residents” that the County worked with to develop the Plan? No one asked me or any of my relatives, and we live in the IEC area.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Cover – A farm tractor/implement is not a representative image of anything in this report because the plan report eliminates farming inside the IEC area.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Inside Cover, Executive Committee – Ken Carter and Dan Vermillion may be on the Committee but they were not representatives of the New Carlisle Town Council as of the January drafting date of this Plan and should have the word “Former” in front of New Carlisle.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Ch 1, Page 1 – It is a misnomer to say that IEC has existed for 40 years. It was not named IEC until after 2015.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>2nd sentence - “….thriving businesses,” - TJ is not a thriving business because they have not met their promises of their tax abatement agreement.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>3rd sentence - If IEC has been a “….focal point for site selectors...”, then why have they not landed a new industry the last few years other than the car shredder and Smith Concrete (both are companies from this region)?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 2, 1st ¶, 1st sentence – “….approximately 7,200 acres....” Response = This statement ignores the fact that the St Joseph County – 2002 Comprehensive Land Use plan limited industrial growth in the proposed area to 2,000 acres and that the St Joseph Co Economic Development Department’s one and only meeting with the public in 2018 indicated that it would be 22,000 acres.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 2, 1st ¶, 5th sentence – “….should be considered a living Direct Feedback that may shift over time....” Response = In other words it may expand and wipe out to 22,000 acres of prime farm ground. The St Joseph Co Economic Development wants to have it both ways saying that the core area is only 7,200 acres but then often refers to a larger area. Where does it stop?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 3, Figure 1.2 – Studebaker proving grounds never was a manufacturer, at what now is Navistar, in 1926 and was not in what was considered part of the Carborundum or IN/Tec economic development area in 1926 through 1999 (see Project Future’s presentations).</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 3, 2nd ¶, 1st sentence – “….can create thousands of jobs....” Response = So does agriculture which is central to the economy in Indiana, 4 out of 10 jobs in Indiana are Agriculture related. – (Source Tim Mclochlin, Ancilla College at the 3/05/20 Farm Bureau meeting)</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 3, 2nd ¶, 5th sentence – “…. minimize impacts....”</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Agricultural lands and natural areas are not being taken with the same weight and study as the potential of industrial interest. This pits one business industry over an existing business (farming) and is undemocratic (with a small d). Turning farm land into industrial use should not be considered lightly, as the impact on the land and the surrounding can last forever. One must only consider South Bend’s brownfields to know how long industrial damage lasts long after the industry leaves the area. Also, benefits to the new industrial landowners should not override the impacts on the adjacent landowners and the community.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 3, 3rd ¶, 1st &amp; 2nd sentences – “…. the county worked …..and engage residents…..”. ….community engagement activities” Response = This part is a grossly misleading statement. There was only one public meeting to my knowledge. For a plan this disruptive to the neighborhood, outreach similar to that performed is developing the 2002 St Joe Co Comprehensive plan should be made. The 3 minutes “Privilege of the Floor” at St Joseph Co government meetings does not count as public input, especially when it is almost always ignored.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 4, 6th bullet point – N.C. Station Feasibility study for NICTD – Response = I’m not aware of the New Carlisle area residents being surveyed as to whether they wanted a new station.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 4, 13th bullet point – St Joe Co Comprehensive Plan 2002 – Response = The IEC Management Plan ignores the fact that the 2002 Plan page 5-3 Policy ii states “No fewer than two areas in the County should be reserved for new and/or expanding heavy industrial uses. These areas will have no fewer than 1,200 and no more than 2,000 acres (gross, including existing heavy industrial uses)”. And Policy vi “No fewer than three areas in the County should be reserved for new and/or expanding light industrial uses. These areas will have no fewer than 200 and no more than 1,600 acres (gross, including existing light industrial uses)”</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 4, 14th bullet point – Proposed N.C. Industrial Park 1972 – I do not have access to that plan right now but I doubt that it included area extending to 1 ½ miles south of SR2.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 4, 3rd ¶, last part of 1st sentences – “…,and an expanded tax base for St Joseph County &amp; New Carlisle Community.” Response = We have heard this promise from St Jo Co Economic Redevelopment Officials before and it did not come true. Project Future made similar statements as late as 1999, yet in 2016 the TIF for the IN/Tec IN/Kote area was rolled over until 2024. And, tax abatement requirements for the car shredder and Scott Brass (now TJ Tublar) is not being enforced.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 5, VISION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>3rd Item – “Thriving Environment” - Response = How does putting railroad spurs over existing Fedrally recognized wetlands make the environment thrive?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>4th Item – Community Resilience - Response = Industry if not a resilient as agricultural land.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>5th Item – Livable and Healthy Communities – Response = The agricultural character will be diminished by taking away farm land. Also, increased truck traffic will definitely not make the community more healthy or more livable.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>6th Item – Coordination and Collaboration – Response = New Carlisle and Olive Township have issued a joint request for a “Moratorium” on further expansion of the IEC.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 9, 2nd ¶, 7th bullet point – Public Comment Meetings –</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 9, 4th ¶, 1st bullet point – OSAA Meeting - Since Appendix B is not provided, there is no way to evaluate these statements.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 10, 3rd OPPERTUNITIES bullet point – “Attract and retain businesses” Response – Farmers are businesses too.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 10, 3rd Concern / ClarityS all bullet points – Response = All of those Concern / ClarityS are still Concern / Claritying, none have been adequately addressed or resolved.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Page 11 last ¶, last sentence – “…..discussion....” Response = Discussion to date has been mostly about telling us what will be, not a two-way discussion inviting and incorporating the public input.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg, 71, Opening statement ¶, last part of 2nd sentence – “….the IEC will create opportunities for strengthening existing businesses,.....” ignores the fact that in reality what it does is chooses one potential business over an existing agricultural business.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg 72, 1st ¶ – It seems ludicrous to point to “agribusiness” as on of the three “target industries” by putting 7,200 acres of agriculture farm ground out of production.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg 72, 2nd ¶ 2nd sentence – “These principals respond to community input,…”? Just what input is that?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg. 72 &amp; 73 AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN OVERVIEW</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>The last sentence = “The objective is to establish a flexible &amp; adaptable approach that can respond to land use decisions by the various landowners within the IEC, allowing them to optimize their assets with minimal disruption to existing businesses and residents.” &amp; as shown in Figure 4.1</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>First sentence = “This section describes three target sectors....” Response: Previous text page 72 calls them “target industry”, this 74 ¶ calls them “sectors”. Which is it, industry or sectors? Is this just sloppy terminology consistency or is it grandiloquence or a ploy to confuse readers?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>2nd sentence = “The IEC ecosystem...”. Response: The definition of ecosystem is a biological community of interacting organisms and their physical environment. What does Advanced Manufacturing and Smart Logistics have to do with a biological community? Is this more grandiloquence? Where is Appendix A?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>3rd sentence = “As mentioned above, the framework...”. More grandiloquence?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>2nd sentence: “...includes businesses that employ large numbers of people, tend to use high-tech and.......”. Response: Employment of large numbers of people and use high-tech are contradictory and conflicting phrases. Except for I/N Tek &amp; Kote, the other 4 manufacturing firms listed do not employ a lot of people. St Joseph Energy is certainly high-tech but we have been told that they only employ 26 people at IEC. SMS Scrap Metal Services is high-tech but they only employ half dozen people at IEC. Smith Concrete is high-tech but other than truck delivery drivers they only employ half dozen people at IEC.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>3rd ¶ Pg 75, 2nd bullet point: Does the plan for the IEC include a “High Tech Manufacturing Training Facility...” that was recommended by MACOG? If so where is it to be located?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>5th ¶ Response: Where is Appendix K?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Comment</td>
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<tr>
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<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>6th ¶ - I do not agree that the IEC should become a future industrial center. But even if I did, the past performance of the St Joseph County’s Economic development Department is no indicator that these strategies would be followed. Due to their selection of companies of the past decade or two with such industries as; a trucking company, a car shredded, two packaging companies, a failed copper fixture company, a failed pipe fabrication company, and a concrete mixing plant does not point to development of a sustainable and resilient industrial corridor in the future. This comment is not meant to disparage these companies but they could have placed in numerous other areas of the county and been a better fit. The point is that the Economic Development Department does not have a very good track record of bringing in companies that fit these lofty strategies.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg 76, 2nd ¶ - How does increasing truck traffic “Celebrate, preserving, and protecting the community’s unique cultural and natural assets is (as) a key priority of this plan” page 28, adhere to the VISION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES #5 “preserve” “New Carlisle’s small-town charm and agriculture character” page 51, “Preserve and protect the natural environment…..” on page 62, or not change the “….acceptable ambient air quality……” page 64, or “….negatively impact the region’s unique agricultural character and natural environment.” Page 69.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg 76, 3rd ¶ - How does “Improving and maintaining a safe and efficient multimodal transportation network…” Be “…..critical…” “….to the livability of the broader New Carlisle Area.”?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>2nd bullet point on Pg 77 - This paragraph is an accurate definition of the kind of development that took place in Elwood Illinois, a description that the St Joseph County’s Economic Development Department has repeatedly indicated that the IEC would not be anything like that. In addition, there is an active multimodal development at LaPorte County’s Kingsbury Development just a few miles to the southwest. Kingsbury is a true redevelopment project in that it is being built on previous industrial land. St Joseph County officials and the Chamber of Commerce often tout the importance of Regionalism, why don’t they support Kingsbury and not destroy agriculture land in St Joseph County?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>1st sentence – The words “all” segments of agriculture and “from growing” are not compatible with taking 7,200 acres of farm ground out of production.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>2nd sentence – Farmers are already using “Smart Logistics” by using GPS to locate how much fertilizer is needed where to minimize the overuse of nitrogen &amp; other crop nutrients and driving farm equipment.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>4th sentence – Yes “Indiana boast 15 million acres of farmland....” but nationally we have lost 100,000 acres since 2015. In Indiana we lose roughly 10,000 acres per year to non-agricultural development. Additionally, the western US depends very heavily on irrigated land which is drawing down their aquifers while at the same time facing more droughts to be brought on by climate change. This is a perfect scenario where we have abundance now but face a challenging future with the loss of highly fertile farm ground over strong aquifers like the Kankakee.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
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<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>3rd bullet point = “Implement farmland policies and programs (footnote 11) within the broader IEC Planning Area to preserve the agriculture character of the region.” Response: Except for one land speculator type farmer within the IEC, most of the farm acreage within the IEC core area is farmed by farmers who farm acreage within the IEC Core Area, live in the Planning Area, and want to remain in the farming business. Taking 7,200 acres out of their production does not increase their business viability which will not preserve the agriculture character of this part of the region. Additionally, the referenced program footnote 11 “Policy Guide on Agricultural and Land Preservation” is not provided for review.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg 77, 4th ¶ - Agribusiness is not one of the preservation strategies that is translated into recommendations anywhere in the report. Over and over it just say’s statements like “implement farmland preservation policies” without specifics.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>2nd sentence – “….following community-driven guiding principles.” Response: This statement is out of date. The Local Government officials (New Carlisle Town Board &amp; Olive Twp Trustees) that were in power in 2016 did not have their constituents’ best interest in mind when they were consulted by the Economic Development Department about the proposed 2016 IEC changes. This was demonstrated in the 2019 elections when all of those in favor of the 2016 changes were voted out of office and the new members of both the Town &amp; the Township sent a letter to the County Council requesting a Moratorium on further expansion in the area.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>2nd ¶ Strong Economy – There already is a strong agricultural economy in the IEC area. Favoring one existing business over the possibility of another kind of business is undemocratic and downright unfair.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
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<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>3rd ¶ Enhanced Mobility – A new South Shore station would cost the tax payers millions of dollars and New Carlisle community does need a new SS station. Multimodal will result in more truck traffic which there is already too much.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>3rd ¶ Thriving Environment – How is increasing industrial development make the environment thrive? This is an oxymoron paragraph statement. It say’s “Valuable water resources will be protected…”, yet the plan includes running a railroad through a wetland, increasing polluted water runoff from large paved areas of truck parking, and putting the bottom of retention ponds setting in right in the aquifer.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>4th ¶ Community Resilience – The St Joseph Energy Center creates electrical power from natural gas. Though it is abundant now, it is abundant due to fracking and is not sustainable. It also puts massive amounts of CO2 into the atmosphere and therefore contributes to global warming.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>5th ¶ Livable &amp; Healthy Community – “….agricultural character will be preserved and celebrated.” How can putting existing farm businesses out of businesses preserve them, and why should that be celebrated?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>6th ¶ Coordination and Collaboration – The New Carlisle master plan is now out of date. The fact that this plan does not include any reference to the current New Carlisle &amp; Olive Township’s moratorium on the further expansion of the IEC is proof that they are not listening to community stakeholders and the risks are not shared equitably by those affected by the IEC. People in the eastern St Joseph County do not have to listen to explosions from the car shredder, face the prospect of massive increases in truck traffic, anticipate increasing air pollution, nor have the prospect of a polluted aquifer.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
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<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Figure 4.5 Concept Area A – Acknowledging that the plan is conceptual &amp; schematic, any one of these purple boxes representing future industry could be constructed in numerous other sites within St Joseph County with just as good, if not better, business environment without running prime farm ground. Also, it is misleading to use symbols of grown woods where none exist now. If a buffer is proposed, specifics on the elements of the buffer ought to specified and be portrayed in a realistic manor.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Page 81 - 1st Bullet Point – New Carlisle and Hudson Lake communities are well served by the Hudson Lake flag stop. Adding 5 minutes of shuttle travel time to this Site A would save the taxpayers millions of dollars.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Last Bullet Point – The IEC Management Plan does not “…Preserve agricultural land….”, it takes away farm land business area to favor one business (industry) over agricultural businesses.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg, 82 - CONCEPT AREA B – The most ill-conceived part of this plan is the new curvilinear road right across existing from fields. Farmers who own this acreage have vowed to never sell out to the IEC yet they face the legal hassle of emanate Domaine for new infrastructure.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>There are also existing single-family residences all along Snowberry Road. How is putting industrial buildings, rail spur, and increased truck traffic right adjacent to their back yards fit with the GUIDING PRINCIPLES IN ACTION of Thriving Environment, Livable &amp; Healthy Communities, Coordination &amp; Collaboration. And how does putting a railroad spur right across the wetlands northwest of this site “….preserve and to mitigate any potential visual impacts.”? Finally, adding 2 miles and 5 minutes of shuttle travel time from the Hudson Lake flag stop to this Site B would save the taxpayers millions of dollars.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Figure 4.6 Concept Area B – Acknowledging that the plan is conceptual &amp; schematic, any one of these purple boxes representing future industry could be constructed in numerous other sites within St Joseph County with just as good, if not better, business environment without running prime farm ground. Also, it is misleading to use symbols of grown woods where none exist now. If a buffer is proposed, specifics on the elements of the buffer ought to specified and be portrayed in a realistic manor.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg 83, 2nd Bullet Point – The last sentence starts &amp; ends with “The Niespodziany Ditch......as well as prevent flooding.”. Adding this many roofs and paved parking roads &amp; railroads to run off to new retention bases with their bottoms in the top layer of the aquifer and the inevitable overflow pipes of swales to the Niespodziany which is already near it’s capacity, is a recipe for more flooding at the south end of the drainage ditch. The runoff from the St Joseph Energy plant already caused flooding at planting time at the south end of the ditch.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>3rd Bullet Point – Of the IEC Steering Committee people listed, none of the OSAA members had ever been invited to any Steering Committee meetings. Jon Mrozinski is no longer part of the Town of New Carlisle government. Nearly all of the rest of the Steering Committee people listed at the beginning of this report appear to have a vested interest in the development of the IEC with a few notable exceptions such as John McNamara and Dr Paul White. With such a biased committee help ensure cohesion &amp; collaboration?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>4th Bullet Point – Has Kingsbury Industrial Park developers been invited to be part of the regional entities invited to partner with the IEC development?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>5th Bullet Point – Adding signage to the IEC seems trivial to this report and it is doubtful to improve branding in any significant way.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>6th Bullet Point – There is no agricultural land shown in the IEC Management Plan and thus far in the Direct Feedback there has not been any reference to trying to keep any of the current farm acreages except to state the lofty goal of “preserving agricultural land”. Also, it is misleading to use symbols of grown woods where none exist now. If a buffer is proposed, specifics on the elements of the buffer ought to specified and be portrayed in a realistic manor.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>8th Bullet Point – Agriculture is already 40% of the economy in Indiana, 4 out of 10 jobs in Indiana are Agriculture related (Source Tim Mclochlin, Ancilla College at the 3/05/20 Farm Bureau meeting). Creating industry on the land of existing farms is simply favoring one business entity (industry) over another (existing farm business).</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg, 86 - CONCEPT AREA D – I presume that reference to Figure 4.78 is a typo and refers to Figure 4.8.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Finally, adding 3 miles and 5½ minutes of shuttle travel time from the Hudson Lake flag stop to this Site D would save the taxpayers millions of dollars.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg, 86 - CONCEPT AREA D – I presume that reference to Figure 4.78 is a typo and refers to Figure 4.8.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>2nd ¶ How does the “The conceptual site plans support the three target industry sectors (Advanced Manufacturing, Smart Logistics, and Agribusiness) and align with their respective economic development strategies.”?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Figure 4.8 - Since the purple boxes are right next to Navistar, I presume that the area is for expansion of Navistar. Since the land speculator type farmer who currently owns the land wants to sell (at inflated agricultural land prices), I don’t have justification to object except to bemoan the loss of prime agricultural land if it in fact for Navistar. In the event that it is just for speculation of some other industry that could locate elsewhere in St Joseph County, then I would be vehemently opposed. Also, it is misleading to use symbols of grown woods where none exist now. If a buffer is proposed, specifics on the elements of the buffer ought to specified and be portrayed in a realistic manor.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Comment</td>
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<td>Chapter</td>
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<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
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<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Also, it is misleading to use symbols of grown woods where none exist now. If a buffer is proposed, specifics on the elements of the buffer ought to be specified and be portrayed in a realistic manner.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg 87, - Upper left photo the New Carlisle sign is not applicable to this area D. In the lower right photo and also mentioned in the 3rd bullet point, Bike lanes are not applicable to this area D.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg 87, - Lower left photo and the 4th bullet point demonstrate that the writers of this Management Plan do not understand the existing water table conditions of CONCEPT AREA D. Most of the surface of this Concept area is only a few feet above the unconfined water-table aquifer and in some places it is below the potentiometric elevation.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg 88, Utility Service – 2nd sentence Inclusion of the words “…without disrupting existing agriculture…” is not possible while taking existing farm ground and covering it with roofs &amp; paving. Nor can it, in the 3rd sentence, “ensure potential new businesses… without impacting existing businesses and residences in the IEC.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>1st Bullet Point – Adding signage to the IEC seems trivial to this report.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>4th Bullet Point – Adding the words “resilient green” in front of the words “storm water infrastructure” does not solve the words “capture water runoff” without specifying how that is to be done.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Chapter</td>
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<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg 90, STORMWATER MANAGEMENT – The 2nd sentence mention of “water quality pretreatment, native plants, and protective measures” are certainly lofty goals. However, the recent additions to the IEC have been to just dig a retention pond to meet IDEM’s minimum requirements. The St Joseph County Engineer informed me that all future IEC development would meet IDEM requirements, as if that was reassuring. IDEM does not require all of the lofty goals of this Management Plan so saying that the lofty goals are anticipated, is not reassuring.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Figure 4.10 - The entire IEC area is the same green color as Bendix Woods. It is unrealistic to envision an industrial megamodel facility as a park, it is misleading to use symbols of grown woods where none exist now. If a buffer is proposed, specifics on the elements of the buffer ought to specified and be portrayed in a realistic manor.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg 92, Integrated Transportation – It is ludicrous to build a railroad across a federally recognized wetland, especially when their viable alternatives. This does not jive with previous lofty goal of protecting the environment.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>¶ 2&amp;3 Edison &amp; Early Road Improvements and Figure 4.11 – Early Road already goes through to Timothy. If this a scribner’s error and Edison Road is meant to go through to Timothy, that cannot be extended in a straight line to the west without going over a wetland.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg, 94 &amp; 95 FREIGHT RAIL IMPROVEMENTS – Again, it is ludicrous to build a railroad across a federally recognized wetland, especially when their viable alternatives. This does not jive with previous lofty goal of protecting the environment.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
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<td>Chapter</td>
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<td>-------------------------------</td>
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<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>New Carlisle South Shore Line Station - The text touts the fact that “The proposed South Shore Line Station is .... near the northern Gateway into the Town of New Carlisle, but, the railroad overpass/US 20 tunnel is a physical barrier between the proposed Station and the Town. The proposed bike/pedestrian tunnel addition would be a welcome improvement to the current situation, but the route to the west side of the bike/pedestrian tunnel would be a long winding path with an extensive gradient. Also, since the Timothy grade crossing over the railroad tracks west of the overpass, there would be an equal need to construct a second bike/pedestrian tunnel on the north side of US 20 to get to the commercial development east of the overpass.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>IEC Shuttle - The same shuttle could also run from the Hudson Lake flag stop by adding just another 2 or 3 miles and 5 to 5 ½ minutes to the route, saving the taxpayers millions of dollars.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Pg 100 – In the next to last sentence, New Carlisle is already a desirable place to live &amp; visit. Implementation of this IEC Management Plan draft would make it less so.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>1st Question = No, the plan does not provide land preservation or conserve green infrastructure by installing concrete, asphalt paving, retention ponds setting in (not on) the top of the aquifer, and running a railroad spur over federally Direct Feedbacked wetland. 2nd Question = Yes, leave it in farm ground, that is sustainable.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Response: This absurd. How can existing businesses (farmers) optimize their assets when the IEC plan is to place industry &amp; roads over their fields? In the case of the existing residents, how is putting more trucks on their roads and industry in their back yards optimize their assets with minimal disruption?</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| hum@roofwiseconsulting.com  | 4/26/2020| 3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?                           | CONCLUSION  
There are multiple areas in St Joseph County that could accomplish the same or better results.  
Pg 104, 1st ¶, next to last sentence – states that the ‘...project team engaged area residents and farmers....” but except for one public meeting and engagement with only those in favor of the IEC expansion, this statement is not factual. Local residents and farmers opposed to the IEC expansion have attending dozens of dozens of County Government meetings, only to be limited to the 3 minutes of Privileges of the Floor and then ignored by the Economic Development Department and the majority of the County Commissioners.  
Pg 105 the 1st & last parts of the 1st sentence – “Successful implementation of this plan will result in ....expanded tax base for St Joseph County & New Carlisle communities. We have heard this story before and it was not fulfilled. In circa 1980s we in Olive Township were told that when IN/Tec’s tax abatement and TIF fund ran its course, the taxes from that Economic Development area would create enough taxes into the local government that our property taxes would go down. The exact opposite happened. When the TIF fund ran it’s course, it was rolled over into the new IEC-TIF fund district until sometime in 2024. | Location | 5       |
<p>| <a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a>  | 4/26/2020| 4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?                           | Overall Comments: The main objection to the IEC Management 2020 Plan Draft is that the size of the IEC is more than 3½ times the maximum size stated in the 2002 St Joseph Comprehensive Plan. This gross expansion should not be contemplated without considering other alternative locations in the County during the public input process of updating the 2002 Plan. | Policy    | 1       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>CONCEPT AREA A – There are existing single-family residences all along US 20. Most of this area is still zoned Agricultural. How is putting industrial buildings, rail spurs, and increased truck traffic right adjacent to their back yards fit with the GUIDING PRINCIPLES IN ACTION of Thriving Environment, Livable &amp; Healthy Communities, Coordination &amp; Collaboration. Also, the text touts the fact that “The site is near the proposed South Shore station, located approximately 2 miles to the east, and could be connected to the area destinations through a shuttle.”, yet does not mention the fact that the same shuttle could also run from the Hudson Lake flag stop by adding just another 2 miles saving the taxpayers millions of dollars.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>Pg 104, 1st ¶, next to last sentence – states that the ‘…project team engaged area residents and farmers….’” but except for one public meeting and engagement with only those in favor of the IEC expansion, this statement is not factual. Local residents and farmers opposed to the IEC expansion have attending dozens of dozens of County Government meetings, only to be limited to the 3 minutes of Privileges of the Floor and then ignored by the Economic Development Department and the majority of the County Commissioners.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>1. Preservation of agricultural lands and small-town culture is very very briefly addressed, but it is not the main interest of the plan. Competitive advantages also include rich soil, good air quality, a strong aquifer, and preserved open spaces and very good public schools.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>1st Question = No, the area should remain farm ground. 2nd Question = Input from the residents in the area should be sought for the guiding principles and then incorporated into the plan.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
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<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hum@roofwiseconsulting.com">hum@roofwiseconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>1st Question = No! This is a huge exaggeration. There was only one public meeting on the IEC and no public workshops to my knowledge. 2nd Question = Outreach similar to that performed in developing the 2002 St Joe Co Comprehensive plan should be made. The 3 minutes “Privilege of the Floor” at St Joseph Co government meetings does not count as public input, especially when it is almost always</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jdiller30@gmail.com">jdiller30@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>You need to put up a commenting form with a single comment box. This multi-box, multi-page format is <em>way</em> too cumbersome. Anyhow, I would <em>never</em> favor sacrificing thousands of acres of the county farmland for industrial development when there's already so much old unused brownfield in South Bend that could be used for the same purpose.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>If someone submits responses online, what confirmation do you give so that they know their response has been (a) received and (b) recorded?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>I see growth as something that can only happen in perpetuity if you protect the systems that sustain it. Every farmer knows this: you cannot keep growing crops on the same land if you do not care for the soil. To grow our economy, we need to adopt a model that is more circular than linear in concept. We need to meet the needs of the people of this place by using the assets of this place. We need to align our vision with the reality that if we don't start taking care of the Earth then or development plans are all just a bunch of nonsense.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>Just a few questions: why has the county Office of Economic Development (OED) felt it necessary to keep the IEC a secret for 40 years? Why is the OSAA group (I happen not to be a member of that group, by the way) being treated as antagonistic, rather than recognized as a group of key stakeholders who live in the development plan area and obviously have very important thoughts on the subject? Why are we even talking about a plan that follows a form of so-called development that is totally inappropriate for the 21st century? The IEC should be a plan that acknowledges ecological realities rather than completely leaving them off its maps. A good plan will meet today's generation's needs in a form of regenerative development that attracts developers from within the community and ensures future generations have a lovely, vital, healthy place to live. It should dovetail with pending legislation such as the Green New Deal. It should involve a network of cooperative, human-scaled enterprises rather than large-format &quot;mega-industrial&quot; sprawl. The OED should spur economic development by revitalizing current available spaces rather than taking farmland and turning it into something else. It should support farmers, who are already an economic engine of this county, by helping them improve their growing strategies and prepare for a global and local market in which agriculture will be the single most important industry, by far.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/3030</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>As pertains to the 24 known archaeological sites referred to on p. 38 and outlined in Appendix D, I have two Concern / Claritys: First, if 24 are known there may be more, perhaps a great deal more, that are unknown. Second, Appendix D, and, indeed, none of the appendices are included in this online Direct Feedback. A transparent process must also make these available to the public in an accessible way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/3030</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>There is an inherent contradiction on p. 48 that I would like to point out because it is illustrative of one of the fatal flaws of this plan. An existing bike route on Walnut Rd. roughly bisects the core development area from north to south. Walnut Rd. is identified on p. 43 of this Direct Feedback, which focuses on the road network and its suitability for transportation (heavy machinery including semi traffic) as a &quot;major connector.&quot; Proposed bike paths would be on Edison and Timothy Rds., also identified as &quot;major connectors&quot; for industrial traffic. How can a roadway be both safe for bicyclists and a major connector for eighteen-wheeled shipping trucks? I wonder if the person who wrote this section of the report has ever tried to commute by bicycle through an &quot;industrial megasite&quot;? I seriously doubt it. As someone who does commute by bike, what the IEC plan is proposing is laughable because it is so dangerous and impracticable. Preserving bike and pedestrian traffic in an industrial megaplex is a dubious notion at best. It forces one to call into question this Direct Feedbacks vague assertions that it will preserve other things, such as natural and community assets.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/3030</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>The Direct Feedback does not mention noise pollution once, despite the fact that this is a major Concern / Clarity for the CDC (<a href="https://www.cdc.gov/nceh/hearing_loss/public_health_scientific_info.html">https://www.cdc.gov/nceh/hearing_loss/public_health_scientific_info.html</a>). The section on air quality is so brief, it causes one to wonder if this has been given any serious analytical attention. South Bend's air quality is slightly better than the national average, and we should be supporting development that will improve air quality in our county, not make it worse. The fact that it is &quot;acceptable&quot; according to the EPA does not mean that it is as clean as it could or should be. An industrial megapark that gives one short paragraph to the notion of air quality in its plan Direct Feedbacks demonstrates a planning process that is fundamentally disconnected from reality, from the world in which humans work and love and breathe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>The Competitive Advantages Section lists &quot;regional, national, and global markets and supply chains.&quot; Conspicuously missing from this list are local assets and local markets. Not a single local or family-owned small business is mentioned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>Is this a serious question? Figure 2.14 shows only five small photographs. It seems to totally disregard the fact that St. Joseph County is a diverse community. It does not show any urban assets. It does not show any ecological assets. It does not show a single person of color, not one. Assets not pictured include (though are certainly not limited to): black and brown people; the St. Joseph River, Kankakee River, and their tributaries; the annual South Bend St. Patrick’s Day Parade; any of the more than 62 public parks and open spaces; all of the innumerable small interactions of neighbors that make up a vibrant rural community; the peace of navigating a community that is not overrun by semi traffick; and the experience of being in Bendix Woods County Park and not being surrounded by an industrial megasite.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>The Direct Feedback claims that the IEC is well-situated because of the state of Indiana's &quot;favorable business environment,&quot; and can therefore offer &quot;competitive incentive packages to business prospects.&quot; In other words, the IEC would take prime farmland, destroy it, and sell to the highest out-of-town bidder. Nowhere does the Direct Feedback suggest that local businesses and entrepreneurs can be the driver for economic prosperity. Nowhere does it explicitly explore the ecological value of a non-industrial landscape with anything approaching nuance or comprehension. This model of development would displace the community of New Carlisle by bringing in big businesses that are driven by the bottom line ultimately. This is follow the outmoded boom-and-bust trajectory, and therefore it would ultimately fail to create regenerative economic affluence for the members of this community and ecosystem. Such so-called &quot;development&quot; is outdated, irresponsible, and myopic.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>On p. 28, the Direct Feedback states that &quot;preserving, and&quot;</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>&quot;Advanced Manufacturing&quot; prioritizes &quot;new technologies&quot;, and one must only refer to Figure 4.3 to observe that the &quot;industrial megasite&quot; as described with the IEC plan would embrace &quot;artificial intelligence&quot; to the detriment of human workers: no human is present in Figure 4.3. The jargon in this section seems to be intentionally vague, because the plan is to attract any industry possible and then &quot;adapt&quot; so that company could go about its business. A solid pillar would start with the needs of the community, clearly envisioned and articulated by that community as a whole. For example, livelihoods are a need, and a job or craft or a vocation are ways to meet that need. Water is a need, and a well or rainwater capture are ways to meet that need. Food is a need, and gardening or farming are ways to meet that need.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>&quot;Smart Logistics&quot; focuses on the &quot;what&quot; of moving people and goods, but not the &quot;how&quot; or the &quot;why.&quot; One fundamental assumption of this outmoded style of &quot;mega industrial&quot; development is that you must extract raw materials from one place, process them somewhere else, sell them somewhere else, and then dispose of their waste products yet somewhere else. This is built on the notion that underlies all extractive industries and can be summed up as: it is OK to improve one place by destroying another place. This is not smart. A smart logistical plan would first ask what resources (human, ecological, spiritual) already exist in the community, and how can they work synergistically for the common good in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>&quot;Agribusiness&quot; is a word we get by combining &quot;agriculture&quot; and &quot;business.&quot; Of course, like any Field, this can take many forms. The form outlined in this section of the Direct Feedbacks is one driven by heavy industrial technology requiring tremendous fossil fuel inputs and causing potential ecological problems in the form of nutrient runoff. A sound pillar would start with the elements that underlie agricultural businesses: water, air, and soil. This pillar would ask first what is in the best interest of the water (converving it, keeping it clean), the air (keeping it free from various forms of pollution), and the soil -- including the biodiverse microscopic biological community that exists in all fertile soil. For brevity, you could call such a pillar &quot;Earth&quot; or &quot;Landscape&quot; or something like that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>So, the pillars of Community Needs, Community Assets, and Landscape would be more appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Yes, we should consider leaving the agricultural businesses that are already in place, in place, and using our taxpayer dollars to find development strategies that improve this sector of the economy.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>Yes. A fundamental restructuring of the approach is required. &quot;Sustainable development&quot; would be characterized by initiatives that arise from the vision of the community to meet the community's needs, starting by relieving the suffering of those who have been historically and systematically marginalized or oppressed by the status quo. Sustainable development would create viable livelihoods embedded within living ecosystems in such a way that economic development is regenerative and involves improving the community (such as by revitalizing existing brownfields and decreasing the rate of poverty among minorities) rather than harming the community (such as by creating new brownfields and putting all of the economic development focus on an area of the county that has a low number of minority residents).</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>On p. 77 I see a great idea, to &quot;minimize induced sprawl.&quot; The best way to do this would be to refocus the IEC plan on revitalizing existing available industrial space.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region's characteristics?</td>
<td>Please tell me more about the promise to create &quot;park expansions, trails, and more&quot; referred to on p. 78, which shows a nice photo of a pond. Where is this pond? Is it in the core development area? Will there be more ponds like this put into the plan area, which I can get to by bike (without being run over by a semi, let's hope!)? Do you know that it can take hundreds of thousands of years for a pond to form?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>What exactly is a &quot;conservation buffer,&quot; and what will these zones be buffering against? Why would a &quot;clean&quot; development area need a buffer zone?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>I would love to hear more about the tunnel idea from p. 96. Perhaps all of the mega-industrial sites could be built with access to this tunnel, and all of the semi traffic could be rerouted exclusively into a system of tunnels, so that pedestrian and residential vehicular traffic is not overrun?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>I love the idea of a shuttle (p. 98). What if we built a light rail system that used all renewable energy and could get me from New Carlisle to South Bend to New Buffalo, so that I could work and visit family and go to the lake, without relying on fossil fuels (and their ubiquitous concomitant pollution). If we could make this affordable for everyone, pilot it here and expand it across Indiana, I would be very much in favor. I think there are some great development models from Europe that we could draw from here. Let me know!</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>The area boundaries are clear. It is a nice little map. I would approach discussion regarding these areas by pointing out what the map is missing. The map does not show (and therefore ignores) the following: groundwater, residential areas, workshops, wetlands, agricultural topsoil, woodland, grassland/prairie, insect populations, vital microbiotic natural resources (such as mycorrhizal fungi), marginal spaces that provide habitat to wildlife such as nesting sites for bird species, migration patterns for waterfowl including endangered species, places for fishing and hunting and dancing. The IEC plan should explain, in precise detail, how it will not destroy, displace, or disrupt these vital human enterprises and invaluable ecosystem dynamics.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>The area boundaries are clear. It is a nice little map. I would approach discussion regarding these areas by pointing out what the map is missing. The map does not show (and therefore ignores) the following: groundwater, residential areas, workshops, wetlands, agricultural topsoil, woodland, grassland/prairie, insect populations, vital microbiotic natural resources (such as mycorrhizal fungi), marginal spaces that provide habitat to wildlife such as nesting sites for bird species, migration patterns for waterfowl including endangered species, places for fishing and hunting and dancing. The IEC plan should explain, in precise detail, how it will not destroy, displace, or disrupt these vital human enterprises and invaluable ecosystem dynamics.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/3030</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.7</td>
<td>Much of the development plan area sits on land once occupied by the Great Kankakee Marsh. Draining this marsh was one of the most foolish things that settlers have done on this continent. The marsh provided an abundance of resources that had been sustaining livelihoods in the region for millennia and would have continued to do so. The map shows floodplains not only surrounded the IEC plan area but also WITHIN the plan area. The wisest thing that St. Joseph County could do for economic development is to restore as many wetlands as possible. In light of climatological changes and ecological destabilization-- which lead to and exacerbate public health crises like the current COVID outbreak -- we need to restore landscapes to a state of ecological health and integrate our human activity within these landscapes. We need to restore wetlands so that we can sequester both carbon and freshwater in the form of precipitation, so that we can refill our groundwater supplies, so that we can continue to live in this part of the world. If we use up our groundwater at the rate we are now without replenishing it, our economic and even our biotic viability will be compromised.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is identified as an advantage for the IEC core development area vis-a-vis other megasites across the country is an egregious disadvantage to the people of St. Joseph County, specifically: the availability, and therefore the availability to exploit, high-quality aquifers. This report makes reference to a team of consultants who studied the aquifer system, but utterly fails to acknowledge two things: 1. That we are living in the midst of a global freshwater crisis (it’s true, look it up), and 2. that a safe yield of water in millions of gallons per day (mgd) is a snapshot of the aquifers current carrying capacity and does not take evolving climatological realities or the democratic process into account. We are not recharging (refilling) our groundwater supplies fast enough because we are disrupting the natural processes of groundwater sequestration and infiltration. When this happens, we are essentially mining groundwater. If we allow heavy industry to continue to take more and more water from aquifers, this leaves less and less for people to drink and water their crops, etc. Every acre that is paved for the IEC threatens our drinking supply that much more, and it exacerbates the global freshwater crisis with severe long-term, local impacts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/3030</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>The Direct Feedback states, on p. 66, that the Niespodziany Ditch is of &quot;poor quality&quot; due to past channelization and agricultural runoff. This &quot;ditch&quot; was once a flourishing stream and is still an important tributary to the Kankakee River. How, specifically, would future development lead to the improvement of the quality (habitat, turbidity, microbiological and chemical factors) of this stream? Is there a binding legal agreement on this? Is there a contract that any industry interested in moving in must first guarantee that it will improve the quality of this important stream? The IEC plan includes no specific measures that will be taken to improve the quality of this and other environmental assets. In fact, the IEC plan includes rerouting this &quot;ditch&quot; -- when they do that, do they plan to re-meander it? To improve the substrate? To re-establish wetlands and a riparian corridor? To decrease agricultural runoff and install diverse native plantings that reduce erosion and improve subsurface filtration? To ensure that fauna (including humans) will not be disturbed by noise pollution and flora will not be harmed by air quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>No, the Direct Feedback's vision statement does not reflect the community's vision for itself. Yes, there are other principles that need to be considered. On p. 4, the Direct Feedback claims that the IEC &quot;aligns&quot; and the County Comprehensive Plan, which states preservation of agricultural land as the #1 priority. This is not alignment, its infringement. On, p. 5 how, exactly, will the IEC contribute to the guiding principles of &quot;Thriving Environment, Community Resilience, and Livable and Healthy Community&quot;? An industrial megasite, as the IEC is named by this Direct Feedback, is the exact opposite of a thriving environment. It is the opposite of what already exists in the &quot;development area,&quot; which is a thriving community that works with the land to produce economic vitality in the form of agricultural products. The IEC cannot preserve &quot;agricultural character&quot; without preserving agriculture: you cannot remove topsoil, put in &quot;large-format development&quot;, and expect a resilient agricultural community to survive. The IEC is antithetical to this aim. Just look at all the brownfields in South Bend. The last thing New Carlisle needs is to become a future brownfield. The vision is missing two key things: revitalization and ecological integration. No economy has any long-term chance of success if it is not fundamentally integrated in a way that an &quot;industrial megasite&quot; can never be. And there is so much brownspace in this county available for revitalization. That is where development should start, not by destroying prime farmland.</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>The Direct Feedback claims that the IEC's greatest asset is its location. But all of the data uses the location in terms of its proximity to other places. In other words, the IEC is a great location from an outside view for its logistics and transportation (trucking), if we just ignore the value and viewpoints of what is already there -- the ecological and human communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2030</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.6</td>
<td>In addition, the land currently zoned as agricultural, equally 85% of 22,000, or 18,700 acres within the development area, should be considered a significant and rightful &quot;development constraint.&quot; Not a single acre should be rezoned. This land, in compliance with the county's Comprehensive Plan, is most valuable as agricultural land. It will only become more valuable in the future, as agricultural land. To &quot;develop&quot; it by destroying its ecological (and therefore its agricultural) integrity is bad business planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>Thank you for this opportunity to provide some constructive feedback. It's clear that a lot of work has gone into this report, and I hope my comments have been helpful. I look forward to a public hearing so that we can continue the conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>Yes, all of them, because the plan does not arise from the needs of the communities that make up St. Joseph County (as envisioned by the members of those communities), it does not take stock of the existing assets in the county as a whole (but rather focuses on the 22,000 plan area), and it demonstrates a fundamental misunderstanding of the ecological realities that undergird all durable economies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>No! Hold a public hearing where the County Council, the director or the Economic Development Office, and the County Commissioners can engage in open and honest dialogue with the public. Then, employ a team of community educators and organizers to launch a planning project that involves every community member having the chance to imagine a map of the county as they would love it to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>No, the Direct Feedback's vision statement does not reflect the community's vision for itself. Yes, there are other principles that need to be considered. On p. 4, the Direct Feedback claims that the IEC &quot;aligns&quot; and the County Comprehensive Plan, which states preservation of agricultural land as the #1 priority. This is not alignment, its infringement. On, p. 5 how, exactly, will the IEC contribute to the guiding principles of &quot;Thriving Environment, Community Resilience, and Livable and Healthy Community&quot;? An industrial megasite, as the IEC is named by this Direct Feedback, is the exact opposite of a thriving environment. It is the opposite of what already exists in the &quot;development area,&quot; which is a thriving community that works with the land to produce economic vitality in the form of agricultural products. The IEC cannot preserve &quot;agricultural character&quot; without preserving agriculture: you cannot remove topsoil, put in &quot;large-format development&quot;, and expect a resilient agricultural community to survive. The IEC is antithetical to this aim. Just look at all the brownfields in South Bend. The last thing New Carlisle needs is to become a future brownfield. The vision is missing two key things: revitalization and ecological integration. No economy has any long-term chance of success if it is not fundamentally integrated in a way that an &quot;industrial megasite&quot; can never be. And there is so much brownspace in this county available for revitalization. That is where development should start, not by destroying prime farmland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>For those not familiar with the project, I would approach the discussion in terms of the democratic process and ecological integrity. This mapmaking process has been top-down. Make it bottom-up: have each person (not just a few, but everyone in the county should be given the opportunity to participate) draw a map of a vision of their landscape as they would like to see it. There are professional educators and community organizers who do this, it is not a pie-in-the-sky idea. Then, synthesize the coalescing patterns from those maps to come up with a tentative plan. Pitch that plan to the people, allow everyone to give their feedback, and then go back to the drawing board. This is a process that will take time. Rather than asking, &quot;How can we produce a map that will attract the most lucrative outside large-format developers,&quot; we should be asking, &quot;How can we bring together a unified vision for our community and imagine a map that both improves the ecological integrity of the place and provides livelihoods for the human community for generations to come?&quot;</td>
<td>Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>To me, there does not seem to be &quot;confusion&quot; so much as indignation. It is clear that key stakeholders were left out of this process (specifically, folks, mostly farmers, who live in the area, many of whom have formed a community group called OSAA to try and have their voices heard), and that it was executed in a top-down way that excluded the majority of people who live in this county. How can the IEC claim simultaneously to have implemented an inclusive planning process and, as the Direct Feedback states, to be &quot;one of the nation's best-kept development secrets&quot;? If the IEC were a good idea, it wouldn't have to be kept a secret.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>The IEC planners used a digital poll incentivized by an Amazon</td>
<td>The IEC planners used a digital poll incentivized by an Amazon gift card to solicit feedback for their plan. Some might consider this an acceptable way to gauge whether people prefer a particular political candidate at a given time or if they prefer a certain kind of soft drink, but this is an ineffective and ludicrous way to go about gathering authentic public feedback. Furthermore, in that poll, the IEC was not named but was described as &quot;clean, high-tech&quot; development that would create lots of jobs. Whereas, in this Direct Feedback (on p. 9), the IEC is described as an &quot;industrial megasite,&quot; the 9th largest in the U.S. This difference in language is manipulative. No one I know in South Bend wants to live next to an industrial megasite. Of course people want clean jobs: yet, is solid waste management &quot;clean&quot;? -- no, but our county still needs it. Is farming &quot;clean&quot;? -- my grandpa used to say that there's nothing cleaner than dirt. The poll failed to ask if people the idea of eliminating 7,200 acres of prime farmland. The poll failed to ask if people want their children to live in a town that is not only full of post-industrial brownfields but also surrounded by them. And the poll failed to ask almost everyone in the county what they think at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jditillo@gsms.org">jditillo@gsms.org</a></td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>A final comment: the Direct Feedback does not list an author(s), nor does it list a specific department or office from which the Direct Feedback arises. An honest, transparent Direct Feedback would do both of these things.</td>
<td>A final comment: the Direct Feedback does not list an author(s), nor does it list a specific department or office from which the Direct Feedback arises. An honest, transparent Direct Feedback would do both of these things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>Yes, while it is hopeful to see the “bike and pedestrian” network or the Concern / Clarity about pollution the plan lacks specificity. There is no “where / when / what / who” especially for the environmental components. Who is responsible for doing these things? Where will the dollars come from to accomplish these goals? What exactly are the commitments and by when? If county parks will be added onto, will there be additional funding for stewardship / maintenance / etc.? How will the county hold industry accountable for green infrastructure / native landscaping / trail and pedestrian maintenance / open space requirements? How do you avoid a free for all as land owners are selling land to industry? How will good intentions be implemented?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>The vision and guiding principles from Chapter One are nowhere to be found here. Despite promises of principles of a “thriving environment, community resilience, and a livable and healthy community,” the competitive advantages focus almost exclusively on industry / business. What about other assets like rich soil, a healthy aquifer, open spaces—and how will these be protected in light of attracting heavy industry or logistics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>Again, if this is an area management plan, it should be addressing how to preserve community and regional assets—not only highlighting them. What has been created here seems like a PR Direct Feedback. If industry comes in, what mechanisms are in place to make sure the “agricultural setting” and “community cohesion” are protected? This reads strictly as PR and does not elaborate on accountability or responsibility so that the assets are protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>Are there any conditions that are going to be set forth above and beyond the minimum requirements required by IDEM for discharging into the sewage system(s) and waterways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Yes, while it is hopeful to see the “bike and pedestrian” network or the Concern / Clarities about pollution the plan lacks specificity. There is no “where / when / what / who” especially for the environmental components. Who is responsible for doing these things? Where will the dollars come from to accomplish these goals? What exactly are the commitments and by when? If county parks will be added onto, will there be additional funding for stewardship / maintenance / etc.? How will the county hold industry accountable for green infrastructure / native landscaping / trail and pedestrian maintenance / open space requirements? How do you avoid a free for all as land owners are selling land to industry? How will good intentions be implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>From earlier, the plan gives no details on who or how the land will be conserved or who / how there will be green infrastructure requirements. However, for sustainable development, one must plan for the entire life cycle of the business. We cannot invite industry or logistics here that will leave brownfields in 20, 50 or 100 years. So it is less about other types of sustainable development and more about how each and every development is planned for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>I would like the planners to recognize that they are making huge assumptions about the prosperity that large-scale industrial development would bring. And greenfield development goes against sustainability and resiliency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>I don’t believe growth and development should come at the expense of the community and environment. Growth and development will only be successful if the community and environment are centered from the very beginning. It should not come at the expense of fertile farmland especially when the city is full of brownfield sites that are ripe for redevelopment. Growth for growth’s sake is not a good. Economic growth –especially in the era of TIF districts and tax abatements—give more to shareholders of industry rather than the communities within which they reside. The county should focus on supporting the businesses here already and creating new ones with local entrepreneurs rather than “attracting” jobs from the outside—those are the ones that leave as soon as they find a place where costs are cheaper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>No, as they assume we want the 9th largest mega-industrial site in the country here and that we believe in this kind of outdated model of development. Both are false. The principles for guidance should include subsidiarity—that the people who will be most impacted should guide the decision-making and ecological stewardship for future generations—don’t plan only for this generation but for 100, 200 etc. years in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>The lack of specificity in the entire Direct Feedback is also quite Concern / Claritying. A Master Plan should entail the “where/ what / when / who” questions of responsibility and accountability. These are lacking in every chapter especially in regards to the environmental components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>The vision and guiding principles from Chapter One are nowhere to be found here. Despite promises of principles of a “thriving environment, community resilience, and a livable and healthy community,” the competitive advantages focus almost exclusively on industry/business. What about other assets like rich soil, a healthy aquifer, open spaces—and how will these be protected in light of attracting heavy industry or logistics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>First of all, it is incredibly frustrating that this question is being asked without sharing the environmental assessment appendices. Also it would be helpful to see the land use over time. Saint Joseph County is losing agricultural land but looking at a “current summary of land use” does not show that change. Next, from the 2002 Comprehensive Land Use Plan (Chapter 3, 3-9), “The floodplain and wet soil conditions in the western part of the County preclude heavy development.” And “Agriculture in nonfloodplain areas should continue to be encouraged.” And we know that the aquifers are very susceptible to pollution. From the Unconsolidated Aquifer Systems of Saint Joseph County map, in the Kankakee Aquifer System “Due to the absence of clay deposits, the aquifer system is highly susceptible to surface contamination. <a href="https://www.in.gov/dnr/water/files/St_Joseph_County_UNC_AQSYS_map.pdf">https://www.in.gov/dnr/water/files/St_Joseph_County_UNC_AQSYS_map.pdf</a> Why are we not taking this advice as constraints?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>This chapter does nothing to explain or remedy the problems residents face from already existing industry. The shredder causes noise and air pollution and shoots debris up in the air over neighbors’ lands. What kind of industry are you inviting into our community? What mechanisms will protect us from their pollution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>And we know that the aquifers are very susceptible to pollution. From the Unconsolidated Aquifer Systems of Saint Joseph County map, in the Kankakee Aquifer System “Due to the absence of clay deposits, the aquifer system is highly susceptible to surface contamination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>No, the area boundaries are not clear and concise. Though the problem is not communicating the area boundaries to the public. The problem is that there is no actual limit to the size of this industrial site. Numbers have been consistently changed and seem to shrink only in light of public outrage. Then, consultants hired by the county pejoratively tell us that we—the public have been wrong about the numbers. I have watched numbers change from 100,000+ acres in 2018 to 22,000+ acres in 2019, to the new 7,200 acres in 2020. But there is no actual limit to how big the “9th largest mega-industrial site” in the U.S. will be. I have no trust in the “7,200” acre number as there is no legal mechanism actually limiting the site to that. This is also in clear violation of the 2002 County Comprehensive Land Use Plan. I believe in quality of life, environmental stewardship, and land for food and future generations. The question you should be asking is “are you in agreement with the IEC”—and the answer is unequivocally NO!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>First of all, it is incredibly frustrating that this question is being asked without sharing the environmental assessment appendices. Also it would be helpful to see the land use over time. Saint Joseph County is losing agricultural land but looking at a “current summary of land use” does not show that change. Next, from the 2002 Comprehensive Land Use Plan (Chapter 3, 3-9), “The floodplain and wet soil conditions in the western part of the County preclude heavy development.” And “Agriculture in nonfloodplain areas should continue to be encouraged.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>I would like to see the IEC actually fit within the 2002 County Comprehensive Land Use Plan. I would like to see less emphasis on growth for growth’s sake and more investment on local businesses that are already here—especially local growers who are focused on providing local affordable organic food. I’d like to see open space be conserved and farmland preserved for future generations. I’d like to see is a tourism plan that looks more like Harbor Country in Michigan rather than an industrial footprint of Gary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Email: jen.a.betz@gmail.com  
Date: 4/25/2020  

2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?

No, they haven’t. Again, there are no actual commitments nor actual numbers included in this plan. There is no discussion that the “willing seller / willing buyer” logic lends itself to a free-for-all with no mechanism for responsibly transitioning land besides a piece-meal rezoning approach. What are the actual legal mechanisms to hold the county accountable to the principles that they outline? What are the legal mechanisms to hold the industries accountable and responsible? As I stated before, there is no teeth in this plan and its only focus seems to be inviting industry to come here on a mega-scale despite the fact that the public has consistently spoken out against the IEC. This plan will only allow the community and the environment to be literally and figuratively bulldozed over. The plan and the county has no proactive approaches or measures to assure the master plan can be implemented without sacrificing the environment, open space, farmland and a rural quality of life.

Email: jen.a.betz@gmail.com  
Date: 4/25/2020  

2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?

No, the area boundaries are not clear and concise. Though the problem is not communicating the area boundaries to the public. The problem is that there is no actual limit to the size of this industrial site. Numbers have been consistently changed and seem to shrink only in light of public outrage. Then, consultants hired by the county pejoratively tell us that we—the public have been wrong about the numbers. I have watched numbers change from 100,000+ acres in 2018 to 22,000+ acres in 2019, to the new 7,200 acres in 2020.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>But there is no actual limit to how big the “9th largest mega-industrial site” in the U.S. will be. I have no trust in the “7,200” acre number as there is no legal mechanism actually limiting the site to that. This is also in clear violation of the 2002 County Comprehensive Land Use Plan.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>No, as they assume we want the 9th largest mega-industrial site in the country here and that we believe in this kind of outdated model of development. Both are false. The principles for guidance should include subsidiarity—that the people who will be most impacted should guide the decision-making and ecological stewardship for future generations—don’t plan only for this generation but for 100, 200 etc. years in the future.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>This question presents a narrative that most of the public would disagree with. There have NOT been various public meetings and workshops. There is no confusion on this point. The County Office of Economic Development collated a list of county government meetings where the public had the right to comment and named those as the meetings on the IEC. That is NOT an authentic inclusive feedback process. A feedback process would actually change the plans based on the information received from the public. Two local bodies of government (the New Carlisle Town Board and the Olive Township Advisory Board and Trustee) actually call for a moratorium on the IEC project until it aligns itself with the 2002 Comprehensive Land Use Plan—they made that decision by listening to community feedback. And yet, you want ideas on how to collect feedback? The public and their elected officials have spoken.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>I also want to express my dismay that the public input process involved a 100+ page Direct Feedback and multiple different places to click and leave comments. The process is cumbersome and does not lend itself to broad community participation.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>The entire premise of the plan should be questioned. Do we think the 9th largest mega-industrial site in the country is the best strategy for New Carlisle and Olive Township—NO! Why do the county planners insist on a plan that is dated from an industrialized past that no longer exists?</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>I also want to express my dismay that the public input process involved a 100+ page Direct Feedback and multiple different places to click and leave comments. The process is cumbersome and does not lend itself to broad community participation.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>This question presents a narrative that most of the public would disagree with. There have NOT been various public meetings and workshops. There is no confusion on this point. The County Office of Economic Development collated a list of county government meetings where the public had the right to comment and named those as the meetings on the IEC. That is NOT an authentic inclusive feedback process.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.a.betz@gmail.com">jen.a.betz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>A feedback process would actually change the plans based on the information received from the public. Two local bodies of government (the New Carlisle Town Board and the Olive Township Advisory Board and Trustee) actually call for a moratorium on the IEC project until it aligns itself with the 2002 Comprehensive Land Use Plan—they made that decision by listening to community feedback. And yet, you want ideas on how to collect feedback? The public and their elected officials have spoken.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jmkazmie@iusb.edu">jmkazmie@iusb.edu</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>A. No. B. Make transparent how the area boundaries have been CHANGED over time.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jmkazmie@iusb.edu">jmkazmie@iusb.edu</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>Wildlife impact, New Carlisle inner residents impact, and an up-to-date aquifer study.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jmkazmie@iusb.edu">jmkazmie@iusb.edu</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>A. No. B. Studies should be done on whether it would be more profitable</td>
<td>A. No. B. Studies should be done on whether it would be more profitable to make use of existing land resources that have been previously vacated by local industry.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to make use of existing land resources that have been previously vacated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by local industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jmkazmie@iusb.edu">jmkazmie@iusb.edu</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>Both residential and public input is NEEDED to discuss effects on</td>
<td>Both residential and public input is NEEDED to discuss effects on residents because you cannot blindly gauge the impact without a basis.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>residents because you cannot blindly gauge the impact without a basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jmkazmie@iusb.edu">jmkazmie@iusb.edu</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>Public comment has to be allowed at EVERY public meeting and workshop.</td>
<td>Public comment has to be allowed at EVERY public meeting and workshop. Public comment so far has been stifled and officials on the matter remain deaf and evasive.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public comment so far has been stifled and officials on the matter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>remain deaf and evasive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:joleenserry@hotmail.com">joleenserry@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>In our new COVID-19 world, I believe that our economic focus needs to</td>
<td>In our new COVID-19 world, I believe that our economic focus needs to shift from development to support and revitalization of our already existing local businesses. All of our tax money being wasted on studies and being dumped into making the area shovel-ready should now be reserved to help existing businesses survive.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>shift from development to support and revitalization of our already</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>existing local businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All of our tax money being wasted on studies and being dumped into</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>making the area shovel-ready should now be reserved to help existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>businesses survive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:joleenserry@hotmail.com">joleenserry@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>The IEC is not wanted or needed in this area. St. Joseph County needs</td>
<td>The IEC is not wanted or needed in this area. St. Joseph County needs to focus on supporting existing businesses and revitalizing already existing brown sites in the county.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to focus on supporting existing businesses and revitalizing already</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>existing brown sites in the county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:joleenserry@hotmail.com">joleenserry@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>I believe the public input has thus far been ignored and the plan has</td>
<td>I believe the public input has thus far been ignored and the plan has lacked transparency.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lacked transparency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:joleenserry@hotmail.com">joleenserry@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic</td>
<td>The area boundaries are much too large!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:joleenserry@hotmail.com">joleenserry@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Farms should be considered for the area. Let the farmers keep farming this area. Agriculture contributes to the economy too. Agriculture has been the back bone for the state and has carried the state's economy in years past when all other facets had performed poorly.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farms should be considered for the area. Let the farmers keep farming</td>
<td>Farms should be considered for the area. Let the farmers keep farming this area. Agriculture contributes to the economy too. Agriculture has been the back bone for the state and has carried the state's economy in years past when all other facets had performed poorly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>this area. Agriculture contributes to the economy too.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture has been the back bone for the state and has carried the</td>
<td>Farms should be considered for the area. Let the farmers keep farming this area. Agriculture contributes to the economy too. Agriculture has been the back bone for the state and has carried the state's economy in years past when all other facets had performed poorly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>state's economy in years past when all other facets had performed</td>
<td>Farms should be considered for the area. Let the farmers keep farming this area. Agriculture contributes to the economy too. Agriculture has been the back bone for the state and has carried the state's economy in years past when all other facets had performed poorly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poorly.</td>
<td>Farms should be considered for the area. Let the farmers keep farming this area. Agriculture contributes to the economy too. Agriculture has been the back bone for the state and has carried the state's economy in years past when all other facets had performed poorly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:joleenserry@hotmail.com">joleenserry@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>There is no way the IEC can balance sustainable industrial development with agricultural preservation and environmental protection. Developing even one acre for industrial use does not preserve or protect agriculture or the environment.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:joleenserry@hotmail.com">joleenserry@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>The 22,000 acre plan is insane. Industry needs to contained and restricted to where it is now. It should NOT move north of the railroad tracks. It should NOT move west of Walnut Rd. It should NOT move east of Smilax Rd or Larrison Bvd. And it should NOT move south of Edison Rd.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:joleenserry@hotmail.com">joleenserry@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Residents that live within the Core Development Areas are opposed to the spread of industrial business.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:joleenserry@hotmail.com">joleenserry@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>Feedback was met with comments like &quot;we'll look into that&quot; or &quot;I'm not sure, I'll have to circle back to that.&quot; During these meetings, the information that was presented was an already laid out plan, PRIOR to anyone giving any input. These meetings have just be presented in a way that says &quot;here's what we're going to do.&quot; Period. I've yet to see anyone come back with a revised that plan that takes into account any of our Concerns / Claritys.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com">jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>If this were implemented, how could preserving this highly important agricultural farmland possibly coincide with the 9th largest industrial site in the country being built over that very farmland? If this were to happen, how would the 9th largest industrial complex in the country not pollute the aquifer over which it would be built?</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com">jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>While the plan acknowledges the importance of agriculture to our economy and wellbeing, it does not make provision for agriculture and industry's coexistence. Air quality, water quality, soil quality are not just important but vital to our county.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com">jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>The proposed building site is surrounded wetlands, lakes, floodplains, and other bodies of water. We do not want any of the pollution that would come from the 9th largest industrial complex in the United States. 7,200 acres is 11.25 square miles. That is 5 times the size of New Carlisle, a fourth of the size of the entire city of South Bend.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com">jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>Using 86.2% of what the aquifer systems can produce (42,24/49 million gallons) -- assuming these numbers are a) up to date and b) correct -- this is a terrible idea. How would you possibly manage the heat and chemical pollution produced from such massive industrial output given that this would max out the aquifer systems' use? How would this preserving the geo-integrity of the area, which currently uses 6% of the aquifer systems? What water usage (both numerical and quality) would that leave for farmers who were in the area, farmers whose livelihood depends entirely on that aquifer? How would this plan not destroy soil for farming, i.e. make it unusable?</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com">jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>“With that being said, the County—along with and their local and regional partners—should implement specific measures to ensure that future development within the IEC does not negatively impact the region’s unique agricultural character and natural environment.” It is not decided that the IEC development is happening, and it is not required to be build. If the IEC is not build then there will be NO negative effects on the agricultural and natural habitat. Building the 9th largest industrial complex in the country is de facto irreversible destruction of farmland, the destruction of the long established livelihood of multiple generations of farms, the destruction of the natural character of the area, and thus the environment of the whole area. There will not have to be Concern / Clarities about “future developments,” as we do not want this development in the first place. Our local and regional partners, namely the citizens of this county have made very clear the direction “development” should take in this area: none. We do not want the IEC here.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com">jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>The entire plan should be land conservation and increasing infrastructure requirements. Imagine how amazing it would be instead of destroying rich soil and pure water quality directly against the will of the community, if all of this planning, energy, and millions of dollars were going into how we could improve our natural environment, support farmers, and invest the money in our libraries, education, and public servants!</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com">jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>Yes, invest in farmers. Establish more conservations lands. Don’t pave over anything. Instead use some of the empty box stores and abandoned industry buildings (brown sites) for this sort of economic attempt.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com">jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>South Bend and surrounding towns are full of abandoned former industry buildings that are abandoned, decrepit, and not a promising sign of industry's future. If we pave over our farmlands, wetlands, and what little of Indiana's natural habitats we have left, this is not retrievable. We do not want more industry coming in here, and we do not need someone to tell us what we want or need. Our multigenerational farmers know this far better than a hired consulting firm could.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com">jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>The county should be figuring out what to do with all of the empty and often decaying buildings left by years of post-industrial and corporation abandonment. Take care of our already plentiful brown spaces. Don't try to create what will inevitably become more. The county should be focused on how to devote more money towards education, libraries, public services, environmental conservation, our farms, renewable energy, plowing, and leaf pick ups, i.e. things that actually respond to your actual problems and actually build up the county. It should be focused on hiring competent employees who are more Concern / Clarityed with hearing and enacting what their constituents want, rather than wasting millions of dollars of tax money on planning for what those citizens expressly do NOT want. It should not force its citizens to have to dig and dig, to ask for a voice at public meetings and to have to ask repeatedly for public meetings, just to figure out what is going on and why our Economic Development office is wasting so much money on something so clearly undesirable and bad for our community and environment. It will be a START in the right direction when the Economic Development office holds a public meeting with the Open Space and Agricultural Alliance and the citizens of New Carlisle, South Bend, and others from St. Joseph county; to hold a public meeting with these and simply listen to the hundreds of voices giving economic, agricultural, environmental, and manifold other reasons why this plan is a terrible idea and how we do not want it. And from there, to stop this process. The sunk cost fallacy is indeed a fallacy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com">jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>This plan would support &quot;major markets.&quot; Has whoever made these plans ever been to New Carlisle? It is all local ma and pa shops. It is a place not marked by population density and &quot;major markets&quot; but by close knit community. People don't live in New Carlisle because they are looking for &quot;major markets&quot; or greater access to transportation. It is a farming town. Moreover, how does paving over 7,200 acres equate to a thriving environment? That is literally environmental destruction. Community resilience? This area is already a resilient community founded on farming, local businesses, built by multiple generations. That resilience, which, I repeat, is clearly established in the area, would go out the window if big businesses were to take over the area for some indeterminate amount of time and decide to leave when things go south. Look at Studebaker; look at Bendix; look at the crumbling buildings that were long ago abandoned by industries deemed no longer profitable that plague the southern part of South Bend; look at the vast empty box stores and buildings north along State Road 23 and south along Ireland Road: within these past few years Bed Bath and Beyond, a corporate bookstore, and Steak and Shake all closed within half mile of each other. These places are all now just empty buildings and there is no discussion of what will happen to these brown spaces. That is what is being proposed for this rich natural land, which supports the local community with food, generations of employment, and a remnant of Indiana's natural resources. Collaboration literally means &quot;working together.&quot; The basic question is not about the details of this plan, but should the county even be doing this IEC? The...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com">jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>No, we do not want or need this in our community. Much of this land is already developed as farmland. We want to keep our farmland and to keep our undeveloped land in its natural state.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com">jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>We do not want this in our county. We have some of the richest farmland in the country and a healthy and vital aquifer. This &quot;development&quot; would ruin these things.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com">jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>The most effective strategy would be to leave these developed farmland areas AS farmland and the undeveloped areas as they are.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com">jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>This Direct Feedback has not addressed the Concern / Clarity of the public. Those have been clearly laid out at multiple Common Council meetings. Instead of addressing these issues, after spending millions of dollars on planning the office of Economic Development thought a good response was to a marketing specialist (a contract for up to $72,000) to try to pitch what we clearly do not want. Farmers don't want this, local businesses don't want this, teachers don't want this, conservationists don't want this, even former industrial workers from the county have voiced at Common Council meetings that they do want this. New Carlisle doesn't want this, South Bend doesn't want this. It is not remotely clear who wants this other than the office of Economic Development, which is NOT listening to its people. We need MORE than simply public input. We need for our Economic Development office to listen to, truly hear, and enact what the people want: stopping this process in its tracks.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com">jonathanwheeler2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>What makes growth? Committed people from that very community, who build up their families, neighborhoods, towns, and county organically, working together, building relationships, sacrificing for each other, going to PTA meetings, going to Common Council meetings, volunteering. Rest assured: any attempt by a few to impose undesired massive corporations and destructive pollution on the community from without is the opposite of growth.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:joyceforbes@comcast.net">joyceforbes@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>2/25/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>I think you have addressed the green space. I do question the size of the rail station proposed for the area. I think it is oversized.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:joyceforbes@comcast.net">joyceforbes@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>2/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>What about seeking Medical facilities such as Beacon med point to locate in the area...we are underserved in this area and I see medical facilities popping up near Granger and Mishawaka with a lack of such facilities until you get to Michigan City or LaPorte...Just a thought</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:joyceforbes@comcast.net">joyceforbes@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>2/25/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>I like the plan as it has studied the area and realizes the negative impact some industry may bring. This plan identifies and offers solutions for green space and buffers between the town and the industrial areas.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jrube44@gmail.com">jrube44@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>Earth friendly food production jobs are needed.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jrube44@gmail.com">jrube44@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Figure 2.14 lacks and needs to include photos of public attendance at some public meetings you put together and county and New Carlisle government public meetings regarding IEC investment of TIF funds that were largely attended by citizens opposed to the IEC spending on infrastructure of tax funds. TIF needs to be abolished as we have too much investment in big, international corporations.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jrube44@gmail.com">jrube44@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Another competitive advantage to highlight is our very fertile over 16,000 year old topsoil, abundant aquifer water and relatively clean air. Stress the fact that for building resilience in our agricultural lands and in the health of those in our community we need to promote regenerative soil management practices by our big commodity farmers and smaller specialty crop farmers. We need more farmers growing fresh produce in our rich soil so that we are not 90% dependent on imported foods. We need USDA facts on amount of the 8 minerals it tracks across regions in the U.S. and compare each of these 8 mineral amounts compared to 1950 (or earlier) also compare incidence of chronic illness in the U.S. population from 1950 (or earlier) from the CDC, NIH and American Heart Association and other agencies. Or, look up Dr. August Dunning's Correlation of data regarding changes in agricultural practices, food borne minerals in mg./100g and chronic diseases incidences from about 1900 to about 2015. We absolutely need more locally produced nutrient dense fresh produce for our health. Get the facts on how Glyphosate effects on soil life and the nutrient density of food crops grown where it is used. How it contaminates the air and rain water over agricultural lands that are being treated with Glyphosate. We need to find Match-Makers who will work on bringing together aspiring farmers, retiring farmers and investors. These three groups of people will need common values of sustainable soil management practices and be creative in finding pathways to farm ownership. Let's see action on this.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jrube44@gmail.com">jrube44@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>If the public was asked what kind of environment they want to live in, I for one would not want to continue to import 90% of my food. Our community needs more fresh local nutrient rich produce.</td>
<td>If the public was asked what kind of environment they want to live in, I for one would not want to continue to import 90% of my food. Our community needs more fresh local nutrient rich produce.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jrube44@gmail.com">jrube44@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>The entire plan was deeply flawed from the very beginning and the over 6 million dollars spent of our tax money was spent without the public involvement in forming the Vision and Guiding Principles.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jrube44@gmail.com">jrube44@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>I want to live in a county, region and state where our local government official and their appointees and employees value, care and respect our fertile soils and we who live here. I need to have many more small farms producing nutrient rich produce and available for sale in our community vs. export. Clean water and air are basic needs as well. We have lost lots of trees and a tree census needs to be taken. I’ve learned we need an average of 20 to 30 trees/acre to restore the hydrological cycle which is critical in reducing global warming.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jrube44@gmail.com">jrube44@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Invite the public to create the community development they need and want. (Indiana imports 90% of Hoosier’s food, this is not being resilient.) Resilience as a principle should be based on essentials needed for life. Execute invitations to all registered voters, residents, to high school Juniors and seniors, in person, in postal mailings, notices in city, towns and county parks and libraries and neighborhood community centers and schools. We are making life changing decisions about our lives here in St.Joseph County which is essentially based on the remaining very fertile top soil which was created over more than 16,000 years, our hopefully mostly clean abundant water supply and mostly clean air.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kawboydan@aol.com">kawboydan@aol.com</a></td>
<td>4/30/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>I can’t find any of the appendices, where are they?</td>
<td>Appendicies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kawboydan@aol.com">kawboydan@aol.com</a></td>
<td>4/16/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>where are the Appendicies?</td>
<td>Appendicies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kawboydan@aol.com">kawboydan@aol.com</a></td>
<td>4/16/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>The size of these areas are huge... Explain that the Study Area is approximately 4 time the area of the City of South Bend, the IEC Area is alomost 2 times the size of Potatoe Creek State Park... these are huge development areas, considering a lot of undeveloped area in South Bend.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kawboydan@aol.com">kawboydan@aol.com</a></td>
<td>4/16/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>The company(s) that build in the IEC area, will there be a restriction or stipulations of hiring people from the county first or within a 30-40 mile radius from the IEC? This is similar to the Honda MFG Plant in Merrifield, OH</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kawboydan@aol.com">kawboydan@aol.com</a></td>
<td>4/16/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>Yes, with this big of a project, this needs to be communicated thru the TV News media, there's an hour and a half of local news every night and I don't hear anything on this project. The team members need to have a 5 minute segment explaining this project. This needs to be presented on all 3 local channels.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kelleysweetpea@yahoo.com">kelleysweetpea@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>The land that is proposed to being bulldozed, never to be fertile again. What a loss!! Wait until we need to feed the country and world, and the county leaders allowed this land to be developed and ruined forever.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kelleysweetpea@yahoo.com">kelleysweetpea@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>Be more transparent. What is the TRUE driver for this development? I can tell you one thing - young people WANT and DEMAND green space and parks. Yet this development wants to develop (and includes) Bendix Woods within the planning area? That is one of the most beautiful last remaining full-growth forests in the county! How on Earth does that make any sense?! Young people will think the old folks pushing this is asinine....oh wait, yep, already do! So good luck finding people to employ; we already know that is a problem for Indiana with our backwards and degrading society that old people want to maintain and digress.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kelleysweetpea@yahoo.com">kelleysweetpea@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>The 'Robust Workforce' is greatly overstated. Young people don't want to live in this state, and this example of shoving a development down people’s throat unwanted, is just one reason. Preserve our land, not exploit it. The access to highways is also overstated. US 2 and US 20 are the only highways in the immediate area.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kelleysweetpea@yahoo.com">kelleysweetpea@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>The vision statement and principles start with &quot;strong economy&quot;. So-called strong economy works for a few and exploits the many. Thriving environment is #3 on the principles, but is a fallacy. Whenever you bring industrial use, you lose the quality of land and can never gain that same existence back, i.e. brownfields. I don't agree with the vision, nor believe the principles are truly guiding this development. The purpose of this development is to load the pockets of a few and exploit the land and people.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin7mccarthy@gmail.com">kevin7mccarthy@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/17/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Why not focus on supporting existing initiatives that don't require destruction of farmland. I believe the money would be better spent redeveloping existing corridors, like Sample St. from downtown to the bypass, than tearing up green space. There is also a running start with projects in that area.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin7mccarthy@gmail.com">kevin7mccarthy@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/17/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>Why this is needed. Please provide the data regarding other partially public &quot;projects&quot; such as Blackthorn, Ameritech, Studebaker Tech center, Ignition Park area, etc. and there current occupancy levels.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin7mccarthy@gmail.com">kevin7mccarthy@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/17/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>No this appears to be an off the books project. I see minimal public support or input yet there seem to constantly be announcements about more spending and commitments. Exactly who does this group report to and why the lack of transparency?</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us">kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Smart Logistics and Advanced Manufacturing should not be in the plan at all. Smart Logistics as seen in Elwood, Illinois and in German Township here in St. Joseph County have destroyed the quality of life for those who live in these areas. We do not want the traffic, noise and pollution that would come with logistics businesses.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us">kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>St. Joseph County should go back to the business of providing first and foremost proper maintenance of streets, support for public schools and law enforcement. When these are properly provided, business will naturally want to locate here. We should no longer provide tax abatements and other infrastructure benefits to them when they should be paying this for themselves.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us">kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>I have read, &quot;The IEC is the ninth largest&quot; industrial development in the United States. This is pretending that the IEC already exists, when it does not. Citizens also need to be informed as to which businesses actually have expressed an interest or have committed to building in the area. Transparency is needed here. Tax payers are involuntarily financing this and are kept in the dark. Since our country is a democracy, the wishes of the people should be respected. If they do not want an IEC near New Carlisle, then the project should not move forward.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us">kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>If proper public input is the goal, then the Direct Feedback and the questions for each chapter need to be re-written so that the average citizen can make sense of it. The language is unnecessarily complicated and the questions too abstract. It is as if you just want approval of the Direct Feedback and not of what it represents.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us">kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Smart Logistics should not be included in these three pillars. The picture of all of the semi trucks in the parking lot from this Direct Feedback speaks a thousand words. In Green Township, the truck traffic has brought noise and litter in its wake. Neighbors cannot get out of their driveways during rush hour. Residents in the IEC zone would not want logistics enterprises.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us">kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Growth should not be to the detriment of rural areas or the environment. The &quot;Market&quot; and profits must no longer be the major factors in development. Our environment is in danger and we can no longer tolerate unbridled construction.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us">kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>The farmland should remain farmland. Development should occur in South Bend - Sample Street and around the old Bendix plant. Jobs would then be more accessible to our urban residents. This would reduce pollution for commuters.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us">kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>The IEC should be scrapped. The old Bendix complex and parking lots are already located near the railroad. Sample Street also is in need of redevelopment. Farmland should not be paved over for new industry when there is plenty of land in the City of South Bend that could be developed. The city location would be more convenient for workers.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us">kkazmierzak@sbcsc.k12.in.us</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>How will these requirements be enforced? Once a company builds and then sells, the new owners may not follow environmental requirements. Uncovered trucks that carry away materials from the Shredder near New Carlisle do not follow requirements. Why should we think that the IEC would be sustainable?</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Furthermore, the public needs to be given access to the appendices described in this draft plan. This public comment process can absolutely not be considered complete until the public is given access to the data in those appendices.</td>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>Industries to highlight: Those small businesses that already exist and are committed permanently to our region, and the agricultural sector that already exists. These need to be protected and there is no reason to bring in big businesses from outside that are going to destroy our way of life and then leave. There should be no part of the plan that competes with the existing economy and ecosystem of the region.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>The area already exists and does not need any &quot;highlighting&quot; as part of a new plan from outside that only cares about economic development in narrow terms. I dispute the idea of an industrial plan in the first place. The people who live in the area already know what is important to them and do need consultants to highlight the areas of importance in their lives. Leave this community alone! The wonderful place of New Carlisle is noted by the planning Direct Feedback draft, but the area residents are already negatively impacted by the industries currently present. Do not add any more industry.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>The plan acknowledge the importance of agriculture in Indiana's economy. It makes no provision, however, for actual coexistence of agriculture and industry. How could adding the 9th largest industrial site in the US be beneficial to farming? Furthermore, farmland captures carbon from the atmosphere. What would be the net increase in carbon emissions of the 9th largest industrial site in the country? How would the major increase in net carbon emissions be mitigated? Indiana already ranks #46 for air quality in the country, and we cannot let it get worse. We should be trying to make it better, not worse. How could that possibly occur with adding more industry? It sounds like a terrible idea.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>What problem is this project trying to solve? I have never heard a good answer to that question. If implemented, it would be sure to create a lot of problems that can never be resolved. If the topsoil were to be removed, the land would never be the same. Stop the planning of an industrial megaplex.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>The increased traffic in the area is already dangerous to students, as evidenced by the New Prairie Schools rule that the students can no longer use the SR 2 route when leaving school. The idea in this plan would only increase the traffic while depleting the air quality for students and cyclists who use sustainable methods of transportation.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>The plan hinges on a huge bet: that economic growth and prosperity will magically follow if we simply allow in mega-site industrial development. This doesn’t align with current trends of automation, global capital, and rapid movement of businesses to save money, and it does not guarantee any investment at all or plan for what happens after the initial businesses, if there were any, would leave. This may bring us very few benefits and cause permanent damage to an established agricultural ecosystem. We need to think smaller scale.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>Before answering that question I will need to dispute and question the figure 3.20 that treats the proposed water usage. The map that is referenced seems to describe an area that is 22,000 acres, but the water use figures only deal with 7200 acres. What is the impact on the aquifer on industrial use up to 22,000 acres? Are we talking about triple the water usage along with tripled acreage? Even if the figures in this table were correct, it is a terrible idea to use 86% of the aquifer’s capacity instead of 6%. The Direct Feedback does not cite any study which says this is a safe level. Why not? Would it be safe? How would agricultural uses relate to the unthinkable vast proposed water use by industry? How would the county enforce regulations and reprimand those who try to press the limits?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>The most sustainable way forward could be found through a new planning process that prioritizes other factors from the beginning other than possible economic investment. This draft of the plan admits it is ultimately about economic growth, defined in a short-term and narrow sense. It never asks whether it would be sustainable to build such a megaplex in the first place. The current draft is wrong to make sustainability an afterthought. That value should be considered from day 1 given all the useful data that is now known about the ecological value of the area, though more is needed.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>No, these areas are already developed, and what is not developed should be kept that way for the sake of our present and future ecological resilience. The destruction of existing residential areas, agricultural industries, ecosystems, and open spaces is too high a price to pay for changes that do not solve any obvious problems in a way that is remotely sustainable ecologically or financially. Permanent destruction of the existing community and ecology is not worth the <em>possible</em> arrival of a small or large number of outside businesses that are just going to leave when it suits them.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>&quot;Additional reasons&quot; that need to be considered are the need for preservation of fresh water and clean air (as I noted in commenting on Chapter 2), along with community and agriculture and environmental habitat should completely constrain the progress of this plan.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>I would like to say that what has not been studied is the first and most important question: Should the County encourage the growth of a 7,200 acre industrial mega-plex site? No.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?

The draft says, "Where possible, these [environment] features will be connected and maintained for future generations." Do you know how it would be possible to maintain them? Do not act like it is a foregone conclusion that some of this irreplaceable ecological system will have to be sacrificed. I dispute the premise. No one is required to build an industrial megaplex. What is going to maintain the environmental features is working together to prevent anyone from destroying our land. The consultants that are reading this do not have to sell out your brilliant minds in order to erase an existing community and farmland and ecosystem that is already very strained, for some hypothetical -- POSSIBLE, not existing or committed -- "industrial megaplex." It would be a terrible idea even if there were an actual set of businesses. But this plan seems to describe destroying environmental features for a POSSIBLE arrival of industries. That is ludicrous. What problem are you trying to solve? I am completely opposed to the plan described in this draft.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>No, these are not good &quot;pillars.&quot; A better strategy would be to focus on promoting the resources the community already has, like the economic model in southwest Michigan. St. Joseph County has a greater number of distinct ecological zones/types than any other county in the state. Pillars could include sustainable small-scale agriculture, ecotourism, beverage brewing and distilling, pick-your own, farm-to-table cuisine, and above all the diversified local economy that already includes agriculture and a number of low-impact, locally-owned, family businesses that have no chance of skipping town for the next industrial megaplex. <a href="https://discovernewcarlisle.com/pages/businesses.html">https://discovernewcarlisle.com/pages/businesses.html</a> Given the historical and ecological uniqueness of the area between the St. Joseph River and the Kankakee River, and given the tourism industry is strong in South Bend/Notre Dame, visitors could be attracted to a restored ecological-historical path system without needing to sustain damage from an industrial megaplex, which would of course cause sound, air, and light pollution, use up clean water that belongs to everyone. Instead of erasing what already exists for a &quot;maybe,&quot; let's accent what is already ours to share: <a href="https://sniteartmuseum.nd.edu/about-us/press-room/the-portage-path-returning-to-our-history/">https://sniteartmuseum.nd.edu/about-us/press-room/the-portage-path-returning-to-our-history/</a></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>See earlier comments on use of existing brown sites, local businesses, low-impact industries, and promoting the existing goods of the area.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>I would like to see economic investment in the county target existing brownsites rather than land currently in use. Let's use the areas scattered throughout our county that were once home to other businesses and repurpose them instead of erasing something that is already home to other uses.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>No, this draft does not specify well enough how the county would plan to “ensure the safety of the area’s assets” by attracting low-impact local industries, and making appropriate regulations and enforcing them. The county needs to give more detail about the effects on residents of the proposed plan. I do not think the county will be able to reduce public Concern / Clarity about the IEC until the process is revised to prioritize an overall land-use plan that integrates all the relevant values and stakeholders. We all know that this draft is based on an outdated business model that reflects the way things were supposed to work decades and decades ago. In this rapidly changing economy that big business model is not going to help our community, and the public knows it. The only way to reduce public Concern / Clarity is to actually let go of this misguided idea.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>No. It seems like the plan is to develop 6,000, 7,000, 22,000, or 102,000 acres. The plan should be to develop 0 additional acres. It is my understanding that the most recent (2002) land use plan for this area called for 2,000 acres of industrial use area, and we are currently over that at 2,200 acres of business use according to this new plan.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>Public input should take place through an updated county-level land use plan. This Direct Feedback puts the cart before the horse. The values on order here should wait for the overall land use plan composed through a public process.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>The planners are correct in saying that a plan is needed – and the County (beyond the Economic Development Office) should strongly consider a full public process in updating its County Land Use plan. This current draft plan only gives a verbal nod to Concern / Claritys raised in the community, but demonstrates little actual strategy – providing vague principles but not indicating how the County would place environmental and land use Concern / Claritys into this plan. Regardless, the premise of the size of the plan itself should be the main and basic question here – do we, as a County, really want to facilitate the creation of the 9th largest industrial mega-plex in the country? Or do we think that we should reconsider an economic vision whose roots are 40 years old, as being the correct vision for the future—when we know how much has changed in the world’s economy over the last 40 years?</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kristi.haas@gmail.com">kristi.haas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>The public has been making its voice heard: Stop this development. All the decisions that were made before and behind the consultation of the public should be revoked, and the county staff and consulting companies are betraying the clearly stated consensus of the vast majority of stakeholders to push forward a project that is obviously beneficial only to a few hidden people at the expense of regular people and the public health. The county staff who have been driving forward this misguided project should be asked to seek other employment given the irresponsible use of public funds in order to try to convince the people this is good for them. The consultants who are complicit should remember that they are not innocent and should use their skills in order to make the world a better place, not to destroy our precious ecosystem and community.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>It should be noted that the Map Image indicating the Aquifer System serving the IEC shows the entire 22,000 IEC “Planning Area” as the “Core Development Area”. This could be that this map was not updated when the plan was updated to the current 7,200 acre proposed Core Development Area. However, it appears that the aquifer numbers have NOT been updated. It seems that further information is available in an Appendix which, as best I can tell, was not made public online. It should be noted that the final proposed build out would presume to draw up to 42.24 million gallons a day from an aquifer system (assuming the wider 22,000 area, according to the proposed map) that would be able to provide 49. It’s very unclear from this Direct Feedback if that’s a safe level, or what protection from industry mis-use would be put in place. However, my main Concern / Clarity is the IEC looking at its numbers appropriately, or are they considering a wider area to make the numbers look better for the report.</td>
<td>Appendicies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>While the chapter focuses successfully on competitive advantages for attracting industry, it fails to indicate how this concept of economic development manages to simultaneously NOT negatively impact many of the assets proclaimed. Preservation of agricultural lands and small town culture is very very briefly addressed, but not the main interest of the plan. Competitive advantages also include rich soil, good air quality, a strong aquifer, and preserved open spaces.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>I don’t understand the point of this Figure or this question, except as a sales tool to attract industry. Of course there are a very many community and regional assets to highlight – and preserve! However, the Direct Feedback is not speaking on how to preserve them, so showing lots of pretty pictures of the things we are trying to protect doesn’t seem very helpful to the Direct Feedback unless there are clear measure being taken to protect them.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>At 7,200 acres, the IEC is being proposed to be the 9th largest mega-site development in the country. Has the planning group done any determination how a project of this scale impacts its surrounding areas – in concentrated traffic, noise, pollution, water use, etc. Additionally, I’m Concern / Clarityed that all land non-constrained by wetlands or floodplains (or currently designated as park) is essentially treated as a potential development place. Farmland is considered to be “open space” or “not in use” in some way that devalues its current use, culture, and development patterns. Restraint could be a key word here.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>It seems clear that this plan wants to put a good environmental face on a tough land use problem and decision. I’d like to argue that before the planners expect us to nod our heads in agreement that we should have the County plan well environmentally for the County – we first need to address the basic premise of the proposed IEC plan: Should the County encourage the growth of a 7,200 acre industrial mega-plex site? If yes – than we should do so in the most responsible manner possible. If NO – than we should still plan in the most responsible manner. I question the premise of the plan: the assumption that this scale of development would be able to be achieved in a positive manner, with proposed good environmental impact. I do not have strong faith that responsible development could occur at this scale – or that the County has the resources to enforce responsibility. I challenge to planners to ask the most essential question here: why is the scale so large and do the citizens</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Repeating comments made in Chapter 4: I’d ask the County to consider reducing its appetite to less than mega-site growth. Perhaps we don’t need to create the 9th largest industrial mega-plex site. Perhaps we could create the largest conservation area, and increase the region’s characteristics, rather than “maintain” them. Could we imagine a robust system of smaller industrial businesses that reutilizes existing vacant and abandoned sites within the City and County, rather than creating future brownfields for the sake of “growth” that may or may not create jobs for residents of the County? Can we imagine ourselves growing and promoting agri-tourism, such as one can see in southwest Michigan, where the land, the towns, the culture, the crops, and the natural environment greatly increase quality of life, promote growth, and offer a sustainable way of development without creating mega-sites that may never be clean again? The plan indicates that job seekers will come from up to an hour away, which I believe to be true – but there is no guarantee in the number of jobs attracted, how much they will pay, and if those jobs will go to County residents. What we as a County should focus on, is a growth and development pattern than strengthens the County for much longer than the next 20-50 years, and to not tie ourselves in such a grand, and permanent manner to industries which are guaranteed to change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>I’d ask the County to consider reducing its appetite to less than mega-site growth. Perhaps we don’t need to create the 9th largest industrial mega-plex site. Perhaps we could create the largest conservation area, and increase the region’s characteristics, rather than “maintain” them. Could we imagine a robust system of smaller industrial businesses that reutilizes existing vacant and abandoned sites within the City and County, rather than creating future brownfields for the sake of “growth” that may or may not create jobs for residents of the County? Can we imagine ourselves growing and promoting agri-tourism, such as one can see in southwest Michigan, where the land, the towns, the culture, the crops, and the natural environment greatly increase quality of life, promote growth, and offer a sustainable way of development without creating mega-sites that may never be clean again?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>It’s clear that the planners desire to make the plan as palatable as possible, to offer trees and paths to hide behemoth development in a way that is not possible, and does not truly co-exist well. The assumption that economic growth and prosperity will follow if we allow what may be permanent damage to an established agricultural ecosystem, by bringing in mega-site industrial development continues to seem like the wrong scale for St. Joseph County. The development along Highway 20 especially shows this contrast, both for the residential areas along the highway, and for the town of New Carlisle. Please consider reducing the appetite for growth for the sake of growth, and the assumption that greenfield development is the only way to increase prosperity for the County.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>The introduction assumes the IEC as a desired project without having to defend the reasons why it breaks away from the current County Land Use plan. It presumes that attracting large business and industry to permanently replace agricultural and natural areas will provide such economic blessing to the community that it outweighs the removal of the agricultural areas the County Land Use Plan of 2002 set to preserve. Public Concern / Clarity is recognized, but an attempt to negotiate the coordination of this Land Use Plan does not seem to have actually occurred, even though the plan is listed.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>This seems to have been a moving target in language. In the June 2018 public presentation, a 22,000 area was clearly marked as the “Core Development Area.” Starting in late 2019, and with this draft report, the 22,000 area is now called a “Planning Area” and a smaller “Core Development Area” has been earmarked. Since this is a new area for the public to see, perhaps I would approach discussions from the point of view that this language has indeed changed, and perhaps the target has shifted. However, some images, such as the aquifer map in Chapter 3, still seem to indicate a 22,000 acre area as the &quot;Core Development Area&quot;. So no, the proposals have NOT been clear and concise, and often the planning team has been very condescending to the public for suggesting the same.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Current industries already lie at the doorstep of New Carlisle, and impact the lives of residents in the area, especially directly east of New Carlisle. We were able to speak to many of these residents, and heard of noise, air pollution, and debris that flies through the air from current industry. Everyone wants the best of New Carlisle to remain, and using these assets as a simple sales tool without ensuring their preservation feels like a false narrative.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>While the IEC plan is starting to mention the importance of agriculture to the region – so far, it doesn’t seem to address in any way how mixing in an increased industrial base will help cultivate this preservation of agricultural lands. It seems to simply say that if we limit ourselves to 7,200 acres, rather than the 2002 Plans of 2,000 acres, we still won’t be using up all of the land. But creating the hoped for 9th largest industrial mega-site in the U.S.? No clear answer here how that answer key priorities of preserving the county’s agricultural lands.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>Yes; the plan should limit the amount of land available to industry, and carefully consider and land use changes that increase the amount of acreage from the 2002 County Land Use Plan, which called for preservation of agricultural area. One major Concern / Clarity I have about this plan is if this much industry is built, what are the future plans for the area once the industry shuts down? Will the industry serve the area for 20 years, 50 years, if we’re lucky, and then leave a brownfield site similar to every other industrial site that has been developed in the area and continues to be abandoned? What would make the industrial development sustainable for the next generation, and for the next 100-200 years?</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>However, this desire to create mega-sites for industry moves directly against the 2002 County Land Use plan, which indicated a limit of industry in the area, and a preservation of agricultural land and land use pattern desired to be preserved and protected. Telling an undesired story in a more pleasing way should not be the aim of the County. If you want to be clear, be honest and transparent. Is it hoped that the IEC will encompass 2,200 acres, 7,200 acres, or 22,000 acres? How would citizens trust your response and limits?</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>The planners are correct in saying that a plan is needed – and the County should strongly consider a full public process in updated its County Land Use plan. However, this current draft plan gives a verbal nod to Concern / Claritys raised in the community, but demonstrates little actual strategy – providing vague principles but not indicating how the County would place environmental and use Concern / Claritys in to this plan. Regardless, the premise of the size of the plan itself should be the main and basic question here – do we, as a County, really want to facilitate the creation of the 9th largest industrial mega-plex in the country? Or do we think that we should reconsider an economic vision whose roots are 40 years old, as being the correct vision for the future?</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>No. If there is a desire to reduce public Concern / Clarity, than the premise of the plan will be opened up to question. I can’t speak for all, but the public may have appetite for development, but perhaps in a different size or scale, and not in the form of mega-site industry. For St. Joseph County to address this, they would need to be willing to question the premise of this plan, the scale of this plan, and to re-evaluate the current County Land Use plan.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>In my opinion, the pillars only matter if the plan matters. We need to back up and first answer the question of IF the community desires a 7,200 acre mega-site industrial area. Look at any of the proposed areas as planned, and you can see the stark contrast of scale between residential buildings and areas, and proposed industrial sites. While it should be applauded that the plan would attempt to be as environmentally sensitive as possible – it should not at this point be assumed that this scale of development is appropriate to St. Joseph County. We should be especially careful about the amount of “Advanced Manufacturing” that we allow. Again, we should consider farming and conservation for the area as current and future businesses.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>“At 7,200-acres, the IEC is the ninth largest industrial megasite in the US.” In my opinion, this is not a goal that our County should be striving for, as the environmental, land use, and quality of life impacts greatly outweigh the possible, but not certain, benefits of future (but not permanent) jobs in the County.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kschuth@juno.com">kschuth@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/13/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>This is a tremendously frustrating statement. There have been very few public meetings where input and engagement was sought. The one meeting in June 2018 fell apart on the consultants when the public present sought to engage the premise of the effort, instead of Concern / Clarity of detailed pieces of an assumed plan. Since that time, public meetings have included all public County meetings, where the public is allowed to comment. A presentation was made to the St. Joseph County Council then in October 2019 – a time lapse of over a year. A draft Direct Feedback was delayed for months. Why has there been confusion? There has been no viable and realistic public process proposed or presented. There have been no benchmarks proposed, set, or hit for public process. Improving this process would come from an actual interest in hearing Concern / Clarity of these pieces of an assumed plan. In fact, worried that most of the feedback has been negative, it appeared that the public process solution was to hire a PR firm to make happy commercials about the IEC, instead of engaging with Concern / Clarityed citizens, or consideration of changing the proposed plan. Those opposed to the entire plan in its general concept are not interested in changes of language – but in holding to policies in the County that protect the land for different use than what is proposed in this plan.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>The Appendixes are missing from the online draft (Cultural Resources Desktop Review; impact on water quality, etc.) The public needs this information in order to make an informed comment about this issue. Also, the consultants who did this research should be named for transparency.</td>
<td>Appendicies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>Saving $ on labor costs is not directly stated anywhere in this section, but it inevitably is a factor in any decision to locate a business with a market in Chicago in St Joseph County. We need to make sure that industrial development benefits all of us; not just the corporate investors. We do not need more jobs that keep our residents underemployed or in poverty.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>The Indiana rankings list includes the state’s ranking for &quot;regulatory environment.&quot; Does this mean Indiana is less strict on environmental and safety regulations? There is not enough info here to know, but this ranking is not a positive one for me. A good tax environment for business means less tax dollars going to things that benefit our community, such as those &quot;great schools&quot; highlighted in the draft.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Quality of life is also a critical Concern / Clarity. Increased traffic, increased air/water/noise pollution are all important Concern / Claritys. Do we need more empty industrial areas, which is very likely to happen if these businesses close? Why aren’t we considering using the industrial areas we already have in the county?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Date: 3/14/2020</td>
<td>Question: 3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>Comment: The very first sentence in this report reveals a significant problem with this plan – a development plan of this magnitude should not be a “best kept secret,” and the lives of rural residents and farmers should not be dismissed by those few who in a position of power (and in a position to make a profit) in South Bend. I would like more info as to the sources of your statements here; for example, does the reference to “1,536 people employed” include the self-employed farmers and small business owners in the county? Who are the “site selectors across the county”? This intro introduces a lot of empty phrases with no citations/sources. Residents deserve real information.</td>
<td>Category: Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>Question: 4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Comment: The “Project Team” is made up of engineering firms that all stand to profit from the plan. On pg. 7, the plan states that “a detailed study of the IEC’s potential impact on the region’s water resources” was completed; who completed this study, and was the researcher employed by the firms on the project team? Why isn’t the study included in this report? The process is not transparent.</td>
<td>Category: Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>Question: 4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Comment: Also on pg. 7, the plan states that at 7,200 acres, this plan will be “the ninth largest industrial megasite in the US.” This is not cited, so I can’t vouch for the validity of that statement. But I think the citizens of St Joseph County should be much better informed on what it means to gain an industrial megasite. What other options can we pursue for jobs in the county?</td>
<td>Category: Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>Question: 1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Comment: Smart Logistics means asking employees to commute, absorbing the $ and time costs of this daily travel. Reliance on car travel for employment is an old model which is outdated; South Bend workers already have problems getting to jobs in the city, due to the expense and limited public transportation. Do we need to increase this problem?</td>
<td>Category: Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Agribusiness as a way of farming is not a sustainable model for feeding our country. It increases pollution and relies on automation to maximize profits. According to a 1992 agricultural census report, small, diversified farms produce more than twice as much food per acre than large farms do. We can be more efficient and support more families if we focused on small scale farming in this region.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Tax abatements mean losing tax dollars for our county parks, schools, roads, etc. How is this megaplex going to address growth in these areas?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Jobs that pay a living wage. Businesses that are good neighbors and truly sustainable. Jobs located next to workers, to minimize commuting costs and time. Having a good relationship with unions, not hostile to unions. Paying their fair share of taxes. Interested in supporting this community.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>The region west of South Bend is perfect for small-scale agriculture initiatives, such as organic farms and truck farms. Approximately 90% of the food we consume in St. Joseph County is sourced somewhere else. <a href="https://www.indianagrown.org/about/">https://www.indianagrown.org/about/</a> - we can begin to change this trajectory, using this advantage of a close proximity to prime agricultural land.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>Other principles that should be prioritized include protecting our watershed and environment; creating employment that does not depend on car transportation; creating employment that creates wealth for everyone (a living wage).</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Advanced Manufacturing means more automation - this study needs to provide more information on the specific employers they are trying to attract with the &quot;megaplex&quot; model.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>Yes, our community has clean drinking water, beautiful green spaces to enjoy, and residents who need to make a living wage to support their families. Traffic is not an issue, but it will be with a 7,200 acre megasite. All the assets listed in figure 2.14 are at risk, due to the current board structure which provides limited public oversight on this plan.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>Water quality is a primary Concern / Clarity for me. There is no mention in this section on the risks of pollution to the aquifers; the draft only states how much they can safely take water out of the 2 aquifers without &quot;depleting&quot; them. And I need to know more info to verify that data.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>Yes, no megaplex! Land conservation will mean little if we have a toxic release in the area. Or increased runoff from large paved areas. Light pollution is also an issue. I cannot read any of the appendixes to know if any Concern / Clarities were already flagged for the region. Why are we looking to develop open land, when we have sites in the city?</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>The area is in a historically significant region. The area surrounding the kettle lakes was a site for prehistoric settlements. An ancient portage path existed in this region, which connected the St. Joseph and Kankakee Rivers, making it possible to travel by water from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. We should protect and highlight the history of this area, not rezone it as industrial.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>All of it requires more public input. It completely ignores the land use plan in place now, which was developed with public input. We should develop a new land use Direct Feedback, with public input, before considering this plan.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>The regulatory environment is a critical Concern / Clarity; the case of the 2019 ArcelorMittal toxic releases into Lake Michigan illustrates that regulatory efforts often take place after a crisis, not prior to one. <a href="https://www.chicagotribune.com/news/environment/ct-indiana-chemical-spill-beaches-closed-20190816-znazwueorcvfipo4hfy5ze7vi-story.html">https://www.chicagotribune.com/news/environment/ct-indiana-chemical-spill-beaches-closed-20190816-znazwueorcvfipo4hfy5ze7vi-story.html</a></td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kwesthues@gmail.com">kwesthues@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Lastly, I noticed the word “sustainable” is used several times to reference the IEC plan (pgs. 2, 4, ). According to Mirriam-Webster, sustainable is defined as “of, relating to, or being a method of harvesting or using a resource so that the resource is not depleted or permanently damaged” The IEC does not follow the current land use plan which protects the fragile environment and aquifer in that region. This is not sustainable.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:laredo98@juno.com">laredo98@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/8/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>A fire station is needed. Entire area would benefit. What would happen in case of extreme emergency? Why hasn’t county or TIF money been set aside for it?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:laredo98@juno.com">laredo98@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/8/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>Bike trails are mentioned many times. Why so many trails? This is cold, wintry northern Indiana not southern California. Come up with achievable, realistic goals. The plan read like a info-commercial selling river land in Alabama. Thank you for you time and consideration. Feel free to ask me for more input. G Arch</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:laredo98@juno.com">laredo98@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/8/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>The plan comes off as the area being a major transportation hub. Chicago and Indianapolis handle that just fine. Also emphasized is warehousing. Nothing has been questioned as to what exactly is being warehoused and how safe it is. Routing and traffic flow seems questionable since LaPorte County has already made a big jump forward at the intersection of 20 &amp; 2. There needs to be a change of direction as to the types of businesses targeted for the area. Allowing a problematic metal scraping company to operate in the area has left a lasting impression of poor judgment on the minds of many people. Emphasize more high-tech and because of todays environment move towards attracting businesses in the healthcare industry. Industries supporting national public health would be better received and give recognition to the community and local region. Companies whose major interest is to export products rather than benefit a national economy should be avoided.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:laredo98@juno.com">laredo98@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/8/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>Meetings should be held in the effected area New Carlisle, not South Bend. A newspaper notice about meetings would be helpful. A more basic, simplified navigation site for those not computer savvy.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:lashumate2@gmail.com">lashumate2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/16/2020</td>
<td>Twenty seven years ago my husband and I moved to the New Carlisle community. We chose this area because we wanted to live in the country and because of the great school system. We are so happy we chose this area and our sons were raised here. We would like to make our voices heard regarding this plan to purchase so much of the farmland for the IEC plan. Please do not ruin our community with this plan. This will bring increased traffic to a highway that we already can’t get out of our driveway on because of the traffic we already have. It will take away precious farmland that this planet needs more of, not less, and possibly ruin the water table that supplies clean water to so many. There is the town in Illinois, I believe Elwood, that did something like this and was left with deteriorated roads, and quite a mess to the point that I believe it ruined the town. Blackthorn Golf Course was created north of the airport and the city ended up having to buy it when it couldn’t sustain itself. Then the poor people on the south side of the airport had to give up their homes so the airport could expand. We should have never been in that situation. And has that commercial area ever filled up? Please don’t create more commercial space that won’t get filled when we have perfectly good farmland that is irreplaceable!! It also seems as if this project is going forward no matter what the residents want which I hope is not the case. Please do a true survey of the residents and you’ll see how many are…</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Laura.S.Fuderer.1@nd.edu">Laura.S.Fuderer.1@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Finally, we have been monitoring birdlife in this area for many years with our annual May Count. Among dozens of commoner species, we have identified less common or “at risk” birds including Blue Winged Teal, Spotted Sandpiper, Horned Lark, American Kestrel, Red Headed Woodpecker (our own logo), Swainson’s and Gray Cheeked Thrushes, Yellow Throated and Northern Parula Warblers, and Savannah and Grasshopper Sparrows. There may be a variety of owls such as the Short Eared Owl and hawks such as the Northern Harrier that need broad expanses of open field over which to hunt for prey. Corn fields after they’re harvested attract Sandhill Cranes, whose numbers occasionally include the rare Whooping Crane. All of these and more species have already lost millions of acres of vital habitat across the state, and are at risk of losing much more due to climate change. The IEC would only put greater pressure on dwindling species.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Laura.S.Fuderer.1@nd.edu">Laura.S.Fuderer.1@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>We’re Concern / Clarityed first of all that by proposing the development of over 7,000 acres of land in that part of the county, it conflicts with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan which was created in 2002 after careful consideration and public input. That plan limits industrial development in this part of the county to 2,000 acres and that maximum has already been met. Further industrial expansion in that area is unwarranted, especially considering the many acres of brown fields that exist closer to urban neighborhoods that could benefit from greater employment opportunities.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Laura.S.Fuderer.1@nd.edu">Laura.S.Fuderer.1@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>The plan contains no suggested limits on the extent or nature of development within the designated region. Decisions like these should have been included in a formal, transparent, and inclusive review and update to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan before 7,000-plus acres were arbitrarily targeted for development.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Laura.S.Fuderer.1@nd.edu">Laura.S.Fuderer.1@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>For decades our Society has weighed in on numerous policies, plans, and proposals by government bodies in our two counties. For this reason we are disappointed in the almost clandestine nature of the process by which this whole project was developed, despite the Introduction which says, The County “engaged residents and community stakeholders throughout the New Carlisle area and St. Joseph County.” When we first read about it in the Tribune, it already seemed to be a done deal, with no input by residents whose property would be affected, let alone the rest of us who care about the county as a whole. And most recently it was shocking to hear that certain individuals’ names were added to the plan as though they endorsed it, when in fact they were highly opposed to it. This is not the sort of transparency we expect from our governing officials. A literal example of lack of transparency is the absence of appendices that are referred to in the plan. Why are they not included on the web site?</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:laydeebug76@gmail.com">laydeebug76@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Many of the things that make New Carlisle great and small are at risk should IEC progress full scale. Look at the Elkhart area with so many jobs they cannot fill, lowering of hiring standards (no drug use policies) just to have a warm body fill a vacant position. Didn’t some previous info say the number of jobs would be highly skilled positions but not an overwhelming amount of jobs created?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:laydeebug76@gmail.com">laydeebug76@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>I notice the terms when possible and above I says conceptual plan can change due to how development occurs. This worries me as it seems this if the &quot;out&quot; should this plan not be followed. To me this says if enough $ is offered this will be abandoned.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:laydeebug76@gmail.com">laydeebug76@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>It seems the vision of IEC planners is moving New Carlisle forward into the future when the primary draw of families to the area is that New Carlisle is more like a trip back in time, we do not want to be the next south bend or mishawaka.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:laydeebug76@gmail.com">laydeebug76@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>The IEC will not keep our small town small and places industrial development over the value of farmland and generations of farming families.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:laydeebug76@gmail.com">laydeebug76@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>All the things that make New Carlisle have the character it has now will slowly be erased by an expansive IEC. Being in the top 10 largest mega industrial areas also brings mega change and consequences.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:laydeebug76@gmail.com">laydeebug76@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>I want to know more what Argibusiness means to the IEC planners and how that use will be followed thru with.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:laydeebug76@gmail.com">laydeebug76@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>I feel the vision and desires presented here sound good but have little faith that promises will be kept ( previously made assurances made with Intec-inkote and the shredder hasn’t been upheld. I felt like Chapter 1 was lot of pretty language that claimed way more “collaboration and transparency” than really existed.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:laydeebug76@gmail.com">laydeebug76@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>I feel relocation of the ditch is ill advised, these water ways / natural drainage areas form as they do over time and messing with nature is never a good idea</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:laydeebug76@gmail.com">laydeebug76@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>All the when possible statements build doubt and not trust and the desire to develop here opposed to other semi-developed areas is Concern / Claritying. I think the green eyed greed monster is a strong Influencer. How are prospective companies going to feel knowing they were /are not wanted or welcome?</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:laydeebug76@gmail.com">laydeebug76@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>Several numbers have been thrown around. New Carlisle Town Council has requested the original ~2,000 acre plan be adhered to, not the current ~ 7,000 acres.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:laydeebug76@gmail.com">laydeebug76@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/10/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>I do not feel there is any confusion, I feel it is all just to look good and not to really listen to Concern / Claritys and make changes. All the tax payers money that has already been spent, millions and then to give tax breaks to potential businesses.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:lewoldham@gmail.com">lewoldham@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>Businesses already in the development have failed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:lewoldham@gmail.com">lewoldham@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Before Covid19 there were more jobs than people here. INTEK had to lower its hiring standard to get employees. WE should be concentrating on our schools teaching tech, math and science and the founding of the greatest free nation on earth.; not the pathetic political correctness that is moving us to socialism.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:lewoldham@gmail.com">lewoldham@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>businesses already in the development have failed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:lewoldham@gmail.com">lewoldham@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>This is just a bad idea. No accountability so far the commissioners have spent a ton of money to move forward on this without realizing it will destroy our community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:lewoldham@gmail.com">lewoldham@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>You should consider the blighted areas of South Bend rather than prime farm ground for this development, once ground is industrialized farming cannot return.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:lewoldham@gmail.com">lewoldham@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>The commission should have looked 14 west the KOP site has land, rail, roads every thing you want.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:lewoldham@gmail.com">lewoldham@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>No. Our elected officials have passed on this issue to a non elected bureaucratic entity.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:lindawolfson2@gmail.com">lindawolfson2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>In late September of 2019, I attended a community forum with about 40 residents of Western St. Joseph County and South Bend (also part of St. Joseph County). The topic for the meeting was &quot;Development Without Displacement.&quot; County residents shared their experiences in struggling for economic development that is truly provides a better quality of life and that does not directly or indirectly cause people to leave their homes. On Saturday, October 12, 2019, a school busload of residents toured the South Bend's west-side and areas of the County targeted for this industrial development. Residents of the West Side of South Bend pointed out empty industrial buildings and land where disinvestment was evident. There seemed to be plenty of opportunities for future investment, providing jobs for all county residents. On October 12, 2019 we rented and filled a school bus and toured both areas. Astounding! So much land targeted for destruction; so many opportunities a short distance away that were being ignoree.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:maryellenoconnell@nd.edu">maryellenoconnell@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>I wish to register my strong rejection of this plan. I looked for a general comment area and tried to send a general comment to the Antero Group. I found no place way to do so. This piecemeal way of taking comments appears aimed at undermining opposition. I will contact my member of the Council to express my Concern / Claritys and opposition to this entire plan and the tactics used to push it through.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:maryellenoconnell@nd.edu">maryellenoconnell@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>In this time of environmental crisis, the last thing that our tax dollars should be funding is the paving over of farm land and the destruction of the few stands of trees and green space left in a county littered with vacant industrial sites and strip malls.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maryellenocannelnd.edu</td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>Build where re-development is needed not in the last green places of our county.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:maternowskim@att.net">maternowskim@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>It seems that there has not been much community input on this project, nor the transparency it should have had. Also on the verge of an economic downturn, and the county already with financial Concern / Claritys, it seems, now would be the time to put a halt to a plan that is not supported.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:maternowskim@att.net">maternowskim@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/9/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>This plan is clearly not supported by the people who live in the area. It appears that it is not in the best interests of the county to develop/ruin land that is prime for a sustainable agriculture future. When the trend for health and wellbeing is to stay local, this plan is going in the opposite direction. We are blessed to have this precious farmland. Once it is gone, it cannot be replaced. Why not use spaces that are not rich for growing? There is already plenty of brown space to use for development in the core of the city of South Bend, where there is a workforce and transportation.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:meoceallaigh@gmail.com">meoceallaigh@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/11/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>There is presumptuous language throughout the Direct Feedback, but specifically in Chapter I the words &quot;sustainable&quot;, &quot;should opportunities arise&quot; are worrisome. The studies suggest a system that sustains business and economic prosperity assuming that the acceptable model of low-tax for building, proximity to high distribution infrastructure, and willing work force is the ideal system because in the past, a highly lucrative industry was deemed a worthy one. Is it prudent to start work on such a project when the economic outlook for a number of years is bleak? What ensures that the (local) workforce's workers' jobs are protected in the event of a national or economic downturn? There is a tension in the building of &quot;thinking&quot; machines, the very machines that reduce human labor - will local workers have sufficient training that they'll not be expendable in a downturn or when those machines the plants build make up most of the plant? What of new domestic areas building on farmland? Will their water come from a New Carlisle city system or be from wells. Granger has run in to problems of poor potable water and insufficiently dissipated waste from individual septic systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:meoceallaigh@gmail.com">meoceallaigh@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/11/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>The language of this draft is presumptuous and suggestive of top-down &quot;we'll-take-this-into-consideration-as-we-still-go-forward&quot;; of a governing parent answers a progeny's piercing questions. Its statements are sometimes salespitches. Its overtures of the plans community benefits are deceiving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?

The Chapter's language perpetuates sales pitch tones that are unnerving again. On page 58, figure 3.2 Concern / Claritying aquifer draw talks of the CDA of water draw being something to to maximize. The footnote says to "note that calculating the remaining (CDA) includes current high capacity well withdrawal so remaining aquifer capacity would apply just to new development with the CDA." It is dangerous to strain acquifers so reliant on precipitation and ground absorption. With climate patterns changing and populations rising, we should not maximize our use of ground water for industry.

3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?

The "Soils" section in Chapter III is not comprehensive but speaks only to those entities whose interests lie in the large-industry building realm: the ground water level depth of a shallow (4-6) depth "not being cost-prohibitive" rather than not being appropriate for building large industry. The natural geology of the area is wetlands and not suitable regardless of existing IN/Kote, various steel fabricating building or St. Joseph Electric plants. Preceding building on the area does not make it prudent or show consideration for the earth's natural resources.

4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?

Clearly on the Kankakee watershed, the proposed project area seeks to boost economic growth in conventional terms and disregards a movement away from the lands natural ecology under the pretense that other industry has used low-tax open space in the past. It perpetuates the status quo that generate dollars but make natural resources a casualty.

4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?

Has a study been done of wind and whether patterns, that southwesterly winds heading toward South Bend traversing an area of steel and concrete will be dry, effecting natural precipitation? The University of Notre Dame's St. Joseph Farms to the east of South Bend were effected by the building of the University Park Mall, an area with much less acreage than the proposed 7,200 acre IEC plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:meoceallaigh@gmail.com">meoceallaigh@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/11/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>South Bend's west side is still in St. Joseph County, has accessibility to all of the same transportation and freight thoroughfares and has a resident workforce that wouldn’t have to travel via Southshore or car. South Bend already has a transit system and greenspaces that can be improved upon. While dated, its Studebaker corridor provides everything necessary for the IEC less only the higher taxes. Why forego an existing, willing workforce and for the sake of luring big industry to a sleek, new development on wetlands. The draft seeks to prevent &quot;sprawl&quot; in Chapter V. Developing south of New Carlisle and west of South Bend and east of Hobart and Hammond is sprawl.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mhumbarger42@outlook.com">mhumbarger42@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>What are the advantages for the people who live there and are forced to leave their homes going back generations? Have you ever thought about anyone other than yourselves?</td>
<td>YES. You are tearing people away from their homes and turning the community there into a dirty factory just like Gary which doesn’t effect you since you live in your suburbs miles away. You are the evil villain in this movie. You will do anything to fill your greedy pockets even if it means neglecting all your morals. The community does not want it here. Why don’t you ask the people here. Why don’t you look us in the eyes while you bulldoze our houses.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Mhumbarger42@outlook.com">Mhumbarger42@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>How many jobs will the IEC bring? Surely not enough to compensate for the amount of space which will be taken, including the “core area” and beyond to the mystery acres surrounding which is next on the hit list.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mhumbarger42@outlook.com">mhumbarger42@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>It’s not the fact that there is no public impact, it’s that YOU DON’T LISTEN TO THE PUBLIC INPUT. You just have a place for “public input” so you can say you have one. Also you make your misguided surveys to people who do not live in the area of the IEC and have no idea what it is and talk about like it is such a good idea, when it is actually not.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mhumbarger42@outlook.com">mhumbarger42@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3.  How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>It’s not the fact that there is no public impact, it’s that YOU DON’T LISTEN TO THE PUBLIC INPUT. You just have a place for “public input” so you can say you have one. Also you make your misguided surveys to people who do not live in the area of the IEC and have no idea what it is and talk about like it is such a good idea, when it is actually not.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It’s a swamp...dig 5 feet and there is water.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mhumbarger42@outlook.com">mhumbarger42@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>WHY do you acknowledge that there is in fact public Concern / Clarity yet do nothing about it? You will not reduce public Concern / Clarity until you taken your underhanded schemes out of what is left of New Carlisle.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mhumbarger42@outlook.com">mhumbarger42@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>3/12/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>No. Absolutely not. We have clearly stated we do not want the IEC so why are you asking this question. The desired outcomes for the people who live here are to not have our homes taken and land destroyed.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mhumbarger42@outlook.com">mhumbarger42@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>3/12/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>The people in this community have fought relentlessly about this and frankly you are spitting on their faces for writing this underhanded, crooked vision statement. This plan is selfish and the only people it will benefit are those with power, not the people who have lived here for generations. Just because you do not live in New Carlisle and don’t care about anyone else but yourselves, does not mean you should slaughter the lives of the commune it’s members who ACTUALLY LIVE HERE and turn this area into an east Gary.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mollmoon@gmail.com">mollmoon@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/5/2020</td>
<td>I have been watching the rollout of the Indiana Enterprise Center Plan, and the pushback from area residents that began in New Carlisle and spread throughout the county. I've visited the IEC site several times, reading for a good and balanced understanding of the IEC proposal and its consequences, both intended and unintended. Most recently, I looked up the web profile of every business listed as existing tenants and found they vary greatly, from a relatively small employee-owned company that makes spools for wire (including a recycled model) to a giant natural gas power plant! There seems to be no awareness in the IEC plan of the value of green business and the vital carbon-free future the world is waking up to. Our whole planet is facing the challenge to change harmful climate-destroying practices and redesign the way we all do business. Many old businesses are coming on board, and many new green businesses are emerging. Why does the IEC ignore this? Is the Redevelopment Commission going to do the same? If, as the plan stresses, this area is so well suited for an enterprise zone, then this plan needs to be put on hold, reassessed and redesigned by the lights of the future. It would be a profoundly negative decision to continue as planned; you, we, everybody, will miss a great opportunity to lead the way toward the future that will keep the planet livable. Imagine the outcome if, say, you ally with South Bend’s Carbon Neutral 2050 Plan; you will get far-reaching positive...</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:monicatmay@gmail.com">monicatmay@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are nice words in the vision statement, but I don't see how a 7, 200 acre industrial development will lead to a &quot;thriving environment&quot; and a &quot;healthy and liveable community.&quot; The area is simply too big. We don't want the U.S.'s ninth largest industrial megacomplex. More opportunities for public comment shaping the outcome should have been allowed earlier on during meetings. Here is the fundamental problem - The IEC plan would put development in the wrong place. St. Joseph County does need development, but the County should be working to bring development where it would be beneficial. The west side of South Bend, where there are brown fields that could be reclaimed productively for industry and commerce and where more and better employment opportunities are needed, should be the focus for redevelopment planning, not Olive Township, where there is already a large amount of industry in proportion to the population. I will send more comments as I have time to work on them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mpfeil1@nd.edu">mpfeil1@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Now we are in the midst of a pandemic in which food security is a major Concern / Clarity. This is not the time to focus on mega-industrial development at the expense of our prime farmland. I as a citizen and taxpayer do not consent! This plan is incredibly shortsighted and destructive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mpfeil1@nd.edu">mpfeil1@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>Yes! Given the context of the pandemic, the whole premise of industrial development coming at the expense of our best farmland needs to be reexamined. We need to protect our land and natural environment, and the shortsighted economic gain for industrialists will not meet the needs of the people of this county or in the long run for this country. How can this prime farmland be cultivated and sustained for the good of all? This is a question that would better serve the common good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mpfeil1@nd.edu">mpfeil1@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>We need more farmers. We need to retrieve basic skills of producing and consuming as locally as possible. We need to simplify lifestyles to adapt to the pandemic and the climate crisis. Growth in interior freedom is necessary. Development of contemplative awareness is necessary. How do we prevent further destruction of biodiversity that gives rise to pandemics like COVID-19? That is a question worth pursuing. Imagine if South Bend were known for its excellent public education system, producing researchers capable of addressing this question. Instead of consulting the Johns Hopkins website for the latest data on contagious diseases like COVID-19, people would seek out information from our local and regional epidemiologists. That is a vision worth living into, not another industrial wasteland.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mpfeil1@nd.edu">mpfeil1@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>Please stop wasting taxpayer money on this project and trying to skirt public accountability. This is our home and our land. It does not belong to industrialists from elsewhere. They will be long gone when we need to clean up the toxic waste and face the prospect of food scarcity in what was once the best farmland in the nation.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mpfeil1@nd.edu">mpfeil1@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>No, there is a big difference between 7,200 acres and the plan to include as many as 22,000 acres. Also, whatever happened to the guidelines established in the County's 2002 land use plan? Clearly, this vision is not abiding by that plan. Why not?</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mpfeil1@nd.edu">mpfeil1@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>No, it does not capture the desired outcomes. Further principles for guiding discernment include: the common good, sustainable land use in the midst of the climate crisis, participation of all stakeholders, and transparency in the decision making process. These principles have not been followed.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mpfeil1@nd.edu">mpfeil1@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>OSAA had not even begun in 2018, when you claim to have met with the group. The fact that preparations were being made in secret, with no opportunity for public input until OSAA started advocating is very disturbing. More effective outreach could include a restorative justice model in which all stakeholders participate. OSAA can suggest how to pursue that model.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mpfeil1@nd.edu">mpfeil1@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>No - it has violated the vision of its own land use plan. Now that we are in the midst of a pandemic, please take this opportunity to step back and realize that industrial economic infrastructure is not what will best suit this land or this county. All we need to do is look at the industrial detritus that still blights the landscape of downtown South Bend. That is what New Carlisle will look like in 20 years. And I haven't even mentioned the pollution of soil, water, air, and all forms of life. Why introduce infrastructure that will ensure this land and all living creatures inhabiting it will be subject for years to come to toxic emissions and waste?</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mrsmilinjack88@gmail.com">mrsmilinjack88@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/2/2020</td>
<td>The quality of life for future generations...the ruination of productive farmland at a time when the world can least afford it ...the violation of our aquifer, another example of writing out a check our grandchildren will have to cash...I'll just pause there.</td>
<td>No - it has violated the vision of its own land use plan. Now that we are in the midst of a pandemic, please take this opportunity to step back and realize that industrial economic infrastructure is not what will best suit this land or this county. All we need to do is look at the industrial detritus that still blights the landscape of downtown South Bend. That is what New Carlisle will look like in 20 years. And I haven't even mentioned the pollution of soil, water, air, and all forms of life. Why introduce infrastructure that will ensure this land and all living creatures inhabiting it will be subject for years to come to toxic emissions and waste?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mrsmilinjack88@gmail.com">mrsmilinjack88@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/2/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>This 'Plan' can't even get past page 2 without including erroneous and outdated information...perhaps Mr. Schalliol can then point to it's continued 'need for further updating' as an excuse for being caught up in his own mis-statements. Finding new graphs and descriptors to repeat the same erroneous information doesn't fix it. It' still ALL WRONG.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mrsmilinjack88@gmail.com">mrsmilinjack88@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/2/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>I think there are more appropriate sites within the county bounds for admittedly smaller-scale projects...but, the again, I'm not much of a fan of MEGA-Anything...anywhere....never mind within spitting distance of our aquifer. As far as jobs go, i hope the county can find another for Mr. Schalliol...who, God Willin’ and the Creek Don’t Rise, will be in need of a new position sooner rather than later.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mrsmilinjack88@gmail.com">mrsmilinjack88@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/2/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save the conversations about 'competitive advantage' for the greedheads and the short-sighted. We need conversations about Good Stewardship and Representational Responsibility'</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>I am Concern / Clarityed with your statement in regards to the 'expanded tax base'. Are you kidding me? You mean we MIGHT see expanded tax bases AFTER you give out tax abatements to attract businesses and hopefully before they pull up stakes and move out after the tax abatement period ends. The residents will be left holding the bag paying more in taxes and our farmland will be littered with junky metal buildings, polluted soil, water and air. Gee, thanks a lot.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>Your statements would leave us to believe your are all about preserving farmland. Funny, but you must have a different dictionary that defines Preserving differently than mine. You are proposing to pave over existing prime farmland and ruin it so that it will never be able to be used for growing crops again. Webster defines preserving as follows and I quote:</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>The farmland is a regional asset. It produces food to feed the citizens of our country as well as other countries. Without farmland to grow crops, we will need to import more food. Why yes, let’s import more food from China so we can have another pandemic thanks to other countries lack of sanitation regulations that help keep our country safe. We need to grow and eat food produced and manufactured in the United States!</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>So the Corporate Income Tax rate for businesses in Indiana is steadily declining. This means big businesses won’t have to pay their fair share in taxes to offset the destruction that comes from their businesses. Gee, thanks a lot. I guess us citizens will have to open our purse strings more so that we take care of these businesses, right? WRONG Quit pandering to the corporations and start taking care of your citizens.. Taxpayers will be expected to pay more taxes to fix broken and crumbling infrastructure caused by these big corporations whose &quot;income tax rate is steadily declining&quot;. This is not fair to the residents that live in this community. We were here first. Our needs take precedence over big corporations. Shame on the government that hands out tax abatements like tootsie-pops to Corporations and then expects the residents to pay for the destruction of infrastructure that we didn't cause.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Our area/community cannot find good help now to fill positions in the manufacturing/trucking industries that are currently here. People that live 90 minutes away won’t come here to find a job. Why would people come from the Chicago area and drive 90 minutes to get to work when they are able to find the same if not better job closer to home?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>Not for me. A better vision would be to have the areas in and around the city of South Bend, Blackthorn, and Portage Prairie industrial areas completely filled BEFORE the powers that be decide to desecrate agricultural lands.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>No. I don't believe the area boundaries are concise. Mr. Schalliol keeps saying the area in question encompasses 7200 when in fact the long range plan encompasses 22,000 acres. The land grab for big ideas needs to stop. I don't believe anymore growth is needed in this New Carlisle area. More residents are against this than for it. Our elected officials who were elected by US and work for US need to conduct face to face meetings with all residents living in the western portion of St. Joseph County to the LaPorte County Line. This meeting needs to be well publicized, held in a big enough venue to hold everyone, with ample time for EVERYBODY to voice their opinions and ideas. Comments should not be held to a 3 minute time limit.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>The introduction stated this area has been chosen because of &quot;Labor Force Availability&quot;. Current area businesses are already struggling to find enough qualified people to fully staff their business. I don't believe that people are going to “flock” to the IEC for work. It seems no one is flocking to the existing businesses that need employees. Those that want to work are already working. And I don't believe people are going to come from the Chicago area to work in the IEC when there are plenty of jobs already waiting to be filled in the Chicago area. You people are dreaming.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Quit giving tax abatements! Over and over it seems once the tax abatement period ends, the businesses pull up stakes and move to a new area to qualify for yet another tax abatement. These businesses never pay their fair share of taxes that are needed to offset the damage their businesses cause to the infrastructure and environment. And then we are left with eyesores of crumbling and rusting buildings.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>Bill Schalliol continually pushes that the IEC will only comprise 7,200 acres when in fact he is looking long term development to encompass 22,000. To ruin this amount of farmland is a travesty and unnecessary. Traffic will undoubtedly increase through the town of New Carlisle as well as the surrounding area. Diesel Trucks will spew toxins and cause air pollution. Increased truck traffic through the main drag of New Carlisle will increase the frequency of vehicular bodily injury accidents as well as putting pedestrians at risk for bodily injury accidents. SR 2 is ALREADY a nightmare entering and exiting between the Bypass interchange at SR 2 and Larrison Rd.. Trucks do not follow the rules of the road and continue to speed on SR 2 over the posted speed limit. Trucks continually run the stop light at Quince Rd. and SR 2 and there have been many, many accidents at that intersection with heavy occurrences of bodily injury.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>The increase in freight trains on the Norfolk Southern tracks will also increase the number of times the trains stop along the way and block crossings. Blocking these crossings is not good and will hinder emergency vehicles trying to get to an accident site. The NS trains already stop numerous times over the course of a week, blocking crossings and preventing school buses, police, and fire vehicles from arriving at their destinations on time.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>The folks at the South Shore need to make up their minds. First it was all about refiguring the eastbound station to arrive at the west end of the South Bend airport in order to save 10 minutes off the arrival time to and from Chicago. Now a study is being done to see if it is feasible to move the station to downtown South Bend. What happened to saving 10 minutes?? Having the SS go to downtown SB will increase travel time as the train will not be able to travel at a high speed while tracking through SB streets and vying for space with automobiles. How stupid!!! Now you are getting rid of the Hudson Lake stop and instead spending oodles of money to place a stop at the east end of New Carlisle. Another stupid move on planners part. If people from Chicago wanted to go to NC, they would already be getting off in Hudson Lake and finding their way into town. Now money has been appropriated for double tracking between Michigan City and East Chicago. This will take years and years to accomplish.....all the while you are still not knocking 10 minutes off the travel time to Chicago. This is another Big Idea that is really just a BIG FIASCO. Keep spending out tax monies when you cant even make up your minds on where the SS should end east bound.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Bike Lanes? Really? Truck drivers don’t pay attention to other vehicles on the road. What makes you think they will watch out for Bikers in the bike and pedestrian lanes? You are a fool if you believe bike lanes will make bicyclists and pedestrians safe. This is just another death waiting to happen.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>The new Electric line metal towers are ugly and not pleasing to the eye at all. They do not blend aesthetically with the historic feel of New Carlisle.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Bringing in the IEC will not contribute to New Carlisle and will diminish the desirability to live, play, and enjoy a slower pace of life within this rural small town setting</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Saying the IEC will celebrate, preserve, and protect New Carlisle's unique cultural and natural assets is laughable. This megaplex will introduce noise pollution, ground pollution, and air pollution and ruin prime farmland that will then never be able to be reclaimed. The mega-plex will ruin the small town charm and rural countryside. People live and move to New Carlisle to get away from manufacturing areas and cities. We do not want this in our backyard. There are plenty of parcels of land available to bring in business in and around downtown South Bend, Blackthorn, and Portage Prairie. Take your big idea there.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>There are still Concern / Claritys over aquifer pollution. You cannot 100% guarantee that there will not be pollution. Also, when the mfg. companies pollute and leach chemicals into the soil, this contamination will spread into the nearby farmlands destroying the farmers crops and causing them financial ruin.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Much of the farmland is peat soil. It is darn near impossible to pour and sustain foundation and footings for large buildings. They buildings will eventually sink, companies will abandon them and the residents will be left with rusted out decrepit buildings and our high yielding farmland will be gone forever.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Air pollution is also a Concern / Clarity especially with increased diesel and regular traffic. Combine the diesel pollution with the westerly winds that blow carcinogens from Lake and Porter counties into St. Joseph County, and you have a disaster for those residents who suffer from allergies, asthma, COPD, and other lung ailments. You cannot guarantee that there will be minimal pollution.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Bendix Woods will be obliterated and taken over with noise, traffic, and pollution from the businesses you think will locate to the south of the County Park. The traffic noise from SR 2 is ALREADY a detriment to this beautiful park. Adding more truck traffic and placing mfg. to the south of the park will completely destroy the peacefulness of this natural gem.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Growth and development need to happened in and around the city of South Bend in all the brown field areas that were previously used for manufacturing but are now vacant. There are plenty of spaces left for new growth around the airport owned land, Blackthorn, and Portage Prairie. You should be concentrating on filling every space in these areas before you turn prime farmland into a nightmare of asphalt and industry.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>We residents enjoy the current uses of our farmland and do not want any further development in our area. There are plenty of spaces to place manufacturing in and around the city of South Bend, also Blackthorn Industrial Park and Portage Prairie. That land has already been acquired. The county does not need to acquire any further farmland in the New Carlisle Area. The only other business use for the farmland would be to start up and Hemp farm.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>Public Input is indeed needed at a public forum, at a time when everyone that will be affected by this plan will be available for public input with no time constraints as to their statements given. The meetings should be during the evening hours. Notices of the meeting should be mailed to all Warren Twp., Olive Twp., and New Carlisle residents, as well as posted on the front page of the South Bend Tribune and advertised on all television and radio stations in the area. Leave no stone unturned. This affects our way of life and ALL OUR VOICES NEED TO BE HEARD!</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>I don't ever recall that anyone asked me for my feedback. And I think it is awful that meetings are not publicized on the FRONT PAGE of the South Bend Tribune, broadcasted on all local news channels, as to remove the &quot;secrecy&quot; to the meetings. Meetings should be held after 6PM so that those residents that work will be able to attend. Some meetings have once again been switched to mornings because the committee people don't want to have to stay at work after 5PM. Well too bad! You work for us and the meetings - all meetings that need public input - should be held when a majority of people will be able to attend.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mt_wendy7402@att.net">mt_wendy7402@att.net</a></td>
<td>3/14/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Public input is a must. The meetings need to be face to face with the residents of Warren Twp. and Olive Twp., and the current residents of New Carlisle. This IEC should be on a ballot and be voted on by the residents of Warren Twp., Olive Township, and the current residents of New Carlisle. The Key word here is COMMUNITY DRIVEN....meaning current residents that will be affected by this mega-plex. Agribusiness currently exists in the New Carlisle development area and should not be diminished by replacing the farmland with buildings and asphalt. The &quot;Plan&quot; touts that agriculture and farming are an important economic driver for the IEC. Since when? Seems you are more than willing to gobble up 7,200 acres initially and then chew off another 14,800 acres for this big idea. Your big idea is nothing short of insane and a bloated plan that has '0&quot; regard with what the residents want. Keep the farmland and increase crops such as Hemp. Our economy is strong and existing businesses cannot find people to fully staff their businesses. It doesn't make sense to me to acquire land when you are not willing to name specific businesses that have contracted to build a facility. &quot;Build it and they will come&quot; is from a fictional movie dialogue. It is not a real life scenario. Seems you are putting the cart before the horse. You are &quot;playing&quot; with our tax monies and have wasted enough money on this big idea. Western St. Joseph county does possess a beautiful natural environment. Do not spoil it with manufacturing when there is plenty of spaces in downtown South Bend, Blackthorn and Portage Prairie and out near the airport. Because you cannot guarantee 100% against possible pollution, we residents do not want that possibility to become...</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>This chapter discusses plans for the following target sectors: advanced manufacturing, smart logistics, and agribusiness. It says that the “objective is to establish a flexible and adaptable approach that can respond to land use decisions by the various landowners within the IEC, allowing them to optimize their assets with MINIMAL DISRUPTION TO EXISTING BUSINESSES AND RESIDENTS.” [capital letters added for emphasis] I fail to see how a 7,200-acre large-scale industrial development project can provide minimal disruption to existing businesses and residents, especially if you consider the business of agriculture with family farms.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mwolfson@nd.edu">mwolfson@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>This chapter discusses existing conditions in the IEC Area. It discusses the transportation advantages in the area, but it does not consider the effects of large-scale industrial development on the clogging of roads and the increased congestion that such development will bring. The chapter also discusses “the importance of the aquifer to area irrigation and potable water needs.” It states, “the availability of several high-quality aquifers provides the IEC with competitive advantages that sets it apart from nearly all of the other megasites of its size throughout the county.” The chapter touts the importance of the aquifers to the industrial development proposed for the IEC, but it doesn’t sufficiently address the monumental loss that would occur should the Kankakee Aquifer become polluted from the influx of heavy industry. We are told that there is a study that address “the impacts of development both on water quantity and quality within the area.” We are told that the study is located in Appendix F, but where is Appendix F? Appendix F, and all the other Appendices, are not provided. The chapter discusses “open space and natural areas “ that contribute to the area’s quality of life and make New Carlisle a desirable place to live, work, and play.” Can it really be contemplated that these open spaces and natural areas will not be negatively affected by the kind of large-scale industrial development that is planned for the area? There is little consideration of the negative effects that such large-scale industrial development will have on pollution in the area: noise pollution, air and water pollution, soil degradation, and traffic congestion.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mwolfson@nd.edu">mwolfson@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>The IEC plan touts the advantages of the area for industrial development. It claims that the industrial development can coexist with agriculture in the area. However, how can a large-scale industrial development of 7,200 acres, and potentially 22,000 acres, not completely overwhelm the agricultural development in the area?</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mwolfson@nd.edu">mwolfson@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>The IEC Plan describes an area of 7,200 acres and a potential area of 22,000 acres for potential growth. This is far too big an area for industrial development in the New Carlisle area. Also, it violates the 2002 County Land Use plan that limited industrial growth in the area to 2,000 acres. Why doesn’t the County consider industrial development in areas of South Bend that have been de-industrialized and sit empty? There are spaces in areas like the Blackthorn Industrial Park in South Bend that are empty. The County Economic Development Director has stated that industrial development has to be put in the IEC because there are no sites elsewhere in the County that can accommodate the large industrial development that is being planned for the IEC. But why is the assumption made that large industrial developments are what should be sought in St. Joseph County? Why has there been no consideration of other kinds of development that would be more suited to the New Carlisle area – and more acceptable to the residents of the area? The plan says that the goal of development is to “minimize impacts.” But how can such a large-scale development minimize the impact on an area that is primarily agricultural?</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mwolfson@nd.edu">mwolfson@nd.edu</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>There aren’t a lot of details in this short chapter. A main fact to be brought to bear in evaluating the IEC, to my mind, is that the residents of the area are overwhelmingly opposed to the IEC. Why should the County forge ahead with a development plan that residents of the area feel will threaten their agricultural base, pollute the environment, and destroy their quality of life? How should those Concern / Claritys be evaluated in the cost-benefit analysis of the IEC? And how do we understand economic development? Is it more factories, more buildings, more businesses, more tax revenue, more jobs? These seem to be the criteria used by St. Joseph County planners in evaluating the success of economic development. Certainly there is merit in some of these criteria, but the main way, in my opinion, we should be judging economic development is in how it makes a positive difference in people’s lives. The people in the New Carlisle area are telling us that the IEC will make a negative difference in their lives. We should listen to them.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>What is highlighted is what makes our area so livable. Taking away those assets, and selling to industries, who only care about their tax abatement and themselves, is not conducive to the way of life here.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>It promotes the advantages for industry, low taxes and economic incentives (amounts to tax abatements over and over for the same business). It promotes advantages &quot;for companies to avoid the congestion and uncertainty associated with the Chicagoland area&quot; Another irony, as this would transfer those problems to our small community. Again, they are only Concern / Clarityed with the potential industries and those needs. It states, “the IEC has the highest volume of trucking freight passing near its site when compared to other competing megasites in the Midwest”. And they want this to increase tremendously? It's so mind boggling! Oh wait, the powers that be won't be impacted, they DO NOT LIVE HERE!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! The people who live on Michigan Street and in the historic homes in the heart of our town, have complained for years about the truck traffic that speeds through, and shakes their homes and windows! And yet, the IEC still promotes US 20 as a route. The Energy plant is mentioned. It only has 21 employees and it states has a 30 year lifespan. Why is such a precious commodity as land that could be used indefinitely, be destroyed by a business that has such a short life span? How many other industries will be like this? Disrupting and destroying people's lives is not worth these few jobs and short lived industries!</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>NO! There are areas around Blackthorn that are still available. There is a huge building being built that has no industry right now. There is a sign to lease it. There have been hiring signs out there. There are for sale signs for land out there. There are several industries already there, with plenty of space still available. What is the holdup? The mechanisms that can be used to reduce public Concern / Clarity is, to slow down the spending, respect the need for public input and questions in an adequate space with adequate time, transparency (which is lacking), and respect for the issues presented. I appreciate the time, Concern / Clarity, and attentiveness given by members of our County Council.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>Yes! Family farms, cornfields, soybean fields, hay fields, wheat fields, woods, wildlife, livelihoods, natural habitat, fresh air, sun and sky and moon and stars and planets, (not blocked by clouds of smoke and steam and huge areas of night pollution by lighting), farm animals, homes, barns, churches, unobscured land, high water table, (one farmer could not get a permit to build a barn because of the water table. How can the land support big industries, and how can they get a permit), access to fresh water (not worry about water pollution or depletion), fresh vegetables and fruits, flowers, green grass, mental well being, calmness, safety, countryside, nature’s beauty in God’s hands. Etc., etc., etc</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>NO! This is historically a farming community, that continues to thrive today. Contain industry to the existing acreage. They tout the area as it NOT being a brownfield. That’s the beauty! There are plenty of brown field acres that should and could be used for some of the proposed industries. As the saying goes, “why mess up a good thing?”</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO! In the introduction, it states that for more than 40 years, this has been &quot;one of the nation's best kept developmental secrets&quot;. They seem very proud of this SECRET. It's true, because it WAS a secret to all but a very few people here in New Carlisle! There was not a true representation from the community in this endeavor. There were people from outside of St. Joseph County and outside of the New Carlisle area doing all of this planning that did not affect their very own lives or homes, or income. The principles that need to be considered, have whole heartedly been brought to the attention of those in authority. They need to heed these thoughts, and DO THE RIGHT THING! Bring it back to the level of acceptable development. There are buildings for sale right now that never flourished, and did not fulfill their promises for a tax abatement out there, creating even more unsightly grounds. More could follow suit, as seen in South Bend and other areas that are being developed in the county. And we can't trust in the selection of businesses to be built. There is proof of that, right now. I question the statement about labor force availability. Elkhart has had many job openings to try to fill, and those are most likely better paying that what would come to the IEC. The jobs need to be in the abandoned land of South Bend, where the jobs are needed, and public transportation can be used. How can we have a thriving environment with hundreds of trucks and trains going through our small community? It's difficult to pull out from a side road now, and difficult to pass slower traffic on US 20. There is no way to utilize trails, etc. with so much traffic surrounding the area. We have a livable and healthy community RIGHT NOW.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>The IEC has back-pedaled on the area boundaries. When the planning was</td>
<td>The IEC has back-pedaled on the area boundaries. When the planning was finally leaked out and discovered, there was an uproar at the number of acres involved. The initial planning area of 22,000 acres was being highly promoted to potential industry in IEC printed material. Now they are saying it was never that high. LIES! Discussion has NOT been promoted by Mr. Schalliol. Many have requested public input, and it has not come to fruition. There needs to be a public question and answer forum, in a SUITABLE facility, to directly answer to the residents regarding their Concern / ClariYs. I feel, see, and hear the egos, the looked down upon comments, and actual contempt for the Concern / ClariYs expressed, by some of the IEC representatives towards the good people who are against this enterprise.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>I ask, what public meetings and workshops? None that I was aware of initially, and only one meeting that I can think of at our library a couple of years ago, or so, where Mr. Schalliol made untoward comments to someone with him while sitting in the audience, that were overheard by others.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>What local business meetings? We own a business in New Carlisle, and were</td>
<td>What local business meetings? We own a business in New Carlisle, and were not aware of any with the businesses. Mr. Schalliol is supposed to be a speaker at a Businessman's Meeting in the near future. A little late in the game!!!</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>not aware of any with the businesses. Mr. Schalliol is supposed to be a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>speaker at a Businessman's Meeting in the near future. A little late in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the game!!!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Need to highlight the family farms!!! Isn't it ironic, how the terms that, "over 95% of the county's farms are family-owned, and many have been in the same family for generations" is now stated in this. Hmmm! I've heard that said over and over by those very people who's farms are in danger! It's mentioned alright in this Direct Feedback, but definitely overlooked in the rest of the propaganda. It only highlights two agri businesses. Left out are many farm businesses with way more acres than these two.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| N/A   | 4/23/2020 |          | This Chapter had a lot of repetition. Just what" community" are they referring to? It doesn't sound like the town of New Carlisle. Why show the pictures of corn and tractors and again mention multigenerational farms when they want to take it away? US 20 is again mentioned for traffic. It is horrendous at present, how can it manage even more truck traffic? It mentioned extending Early Road to Timothy Road. Duh, it already connects and crosses over Timothy!. Many homes and places of worship would be lost with widening, meaning even more devastation to our people who moved there for a reason. They talk of more waste water treatment plants. These are sooo lovely! It states a "buffer zone should be preserved to mitigate any potential and visual impacts". Where is the buffer zone between the Energy Plant and the town. I live right in town and view the plant from my front window. Many days and nights, I am greeted with humongous plumes of white vapor (smoke, steam, whatever) that blocks the sky. An engineer employee admitted to several of us, that it emits CO2, but not as much as our neighbors to the west. So reassuring! It talks about the "impressive" volume of freight flow through our area, and touts "Indiana's freight flow is projected to continue to grow substantially over the coming decades(close to 60% by 2040)". Why would we welcome that increased torture? I find that is propaganda trying to appease the opponents and trying to impress those who have not followed this drama AND without adequate public input!!!!!!!
<p>|       |            |          | Representation                                                                lias 4                      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALL AREAS! Everything needs public input, which has been sorely lacking despite their claims. As to why, a handful of unelected people have been running this debacle from the beginning. They don't live here, and have no vested interest in this land. I am praying that the two new members will dutifully explore this, and listen to the hundreds against this huge endeavor. Mr.Schalliol has been given what essentially amounts to a blank check and carte blanche on spending. The unprecedented spending of thousands of dollars on radio commercials, Survey Monkey survey, and website with dubious questions are some of the examples to try to undermine the efforts of the Concern / Clarityed citizens, and slant the views of other potential opponents.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:netlinkssb.lb@gmail.com">netlinkssb.lb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>No future growth necessary where there are farm lands and homes and the only aquifer anywhere</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:newcarlkid@aol.com">newcarlkid@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Jobs that are in urban areas - utilizing brownfields - where people could walk or bike to work. Provide jobs that strengthen the economy by increasing job availability - not REPLACING a vibrant vocation - farming.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:newcarlkid@aol.com">newcarlkid@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>Other than the fact that a vast majority of residents don't want to see this level of growth? Existing conditions such as genuine public input? That type of existing condition?</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:newcarlkid@aol.com">newcarlkid@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>Why? Because this has never been a genuine collaborative effort - and you are kidding yourselves if you think that. The ONLY input that was listened to was by those hired and paid to give it.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:newcarlkid@aol.com">newcarlkid@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>This is not a county issue. This is a Bill Schalliol, County Redevelopment Commission, County Commissioners ISSUE. They are the ones who decided that this would be “best” for us. That New Carlisle needed to be “improved”.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:newcarlkid@aol.com">newcarlkid@aol.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>I just spent 2 hours on this Direct Feedback/ responses. If you think citizens are going to take that about of time to weed through all this spin, you will fulfill your prophesy and not get many responses. This Direct Feedback is painful to read and repeats itself immensely. It would have been much easier to adhere to the County Comprehensive Plan - or better yet, create a new one with genuine input and collaboration. Instead, you have chosen to bulldoze a flawed product to the tune of a few million dollars. Great job. There are no winners in this no matter how it turns out.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ptillich@csinet.net">ptillich@csinet.net</a></td>
<td>3/30/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>No they are not. Need clarification how they are going to wrap an industrial area around Bendix Woods and the how that will effect the park</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ptillich@csinet.net">ptillich@csinet.net</a></td>
<td>3/30/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Chapter 1 talks about minimizing impact to surrounding area but you can't have a 7200 acre plan and think it won't adversely affect the quaint community, the ground water, the air quality, along with the increase of vehicle accidents along Rt 2 and Rt 20 roads.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ptillich@csinet.net">ptillich@csinet.net</a></td>
<td>3/30/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>Seems a lot of planning was done before feedback was gathered. Need meeting where there is real information not the council members displaying their agenda</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:pwindsfarm@gmail.com">pwindsfarm@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>In my background as both a wetland scientist, and a small farmer, I view this project location as a very inappropriate location for an industrial site in the first place. Mentioned Appendices are not available so I can’t really study the specifics in great detail. Although the topography varies, the entire Kankakee basin (which includes the Niespodziany Ditch and environs) is a former wetland, drained using government funds in the early part of the 20th century. Most scientists view this drainage as an ecological mistake since the habitat loss and increased water movement out of the watershed was extensive, causing downstream issues and eliminating the soil and contaminant filtering functions of wetlands. Many economists have also weighed in on the negatives, pointing out that the profit margin has not been very high from this type of land with groundwater so close to the surface. Pumping is required to keep much of the land free of standing water, which explains why much of the acreage currently not being farmed, has reverted to wildlife habitat and natural vegetation. With climate change now a confirmed reality, the acres being discussed will become, in general, wetter; with increased rainfall and more frequent “100 year floods” projected for our general geographic location.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:pwindsfarm@gmail.com">pwindsfarm@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conservationism is not the same word as conservation. Conservationism implies a political agenda. Conservation is the actual conserving of resources, usually applied to natural resources. As is commonly forgotten, the natural resources of planet Earth are not infinite. I strongly believe it is our moral duty to those who come after us to use resources wisely and not leave future generations with less than what we had to enjoy. Hey, it’s in the girl scout pledge!! Anyways, even though that might seem political, I believe all people understand and appreciate that we are only temporary stewards of these valuable Earth resources and we must choose wisely for the benefit of all, not for the profits of a relative few. We as a generation have already taken more than our fair share, and it would be prudent and in our best interest to start giving back. The Earth is protesting in the form of climate change. Climate change should be the barometer by which we measure each and every current action in the hope of reversing what is happening. I don’t believe this proposed project plan ever mentions a positive effect or negative effects on climate. I would like to see some numbers on how this project will decrease our area’s carbon output. I would like to see projects proposed that would help me decrease my carbon output.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:pwindsfarm@gmail.com">pwindsfarm@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>The highest and best use for land with flooding potential is as natural habitat in the low spots, combined with small farming, forestry, and other light industrial and forestry or value added enterprises on higher ground. I’m not opposed to development of specific types. For example, I liked the idea of an additional rail stop for the South Shore Line. This would allow more access to the citizens of South Bend and Michigan City/New Buffalo to enjoy the natural beauty of our County’s parks and the amenities of downtown New Carlisle.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:pwindsfarm@gmail.com">pwindsfarm@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>I believe a new Comprehensive County Land Use Plan should and must be legally created before a project this large is approved. A new Comprehensive Land Use Plan would cover every proposed development in the County and invite public comment and approval in a democratic and open process; instead of going about development plans piecemeal as this project proposal has seemed to. Citizens are being asked to go through each development plan, many pages, created by the Redevelopment Commission, as it arises; instead of referring to an established County Wide Plan, agreed upon and with input from multiple stakeholders and knowledgeable citizens, that would dictate the terms of development. Citizens would have a structured plan for input BEFORE decisions are made and money spent on studies and BEFORE development proceeds; rather than being forced to raise a clamor against studies that have already been done and things that have already happened; and are being belatedly reported after the fact. Decisions would be made during the creation of the County Wide Plan and I certainly hope that they take climate change into account. I’m dismayed that the name given to this plan was the Area Management Plan. A very obfuscating name for ordinary citizens who would think well, it’s the Area Management Plan. That must be the same as a Comprehensive County Land Use Plan. It’s clearly not. We need a Carbon Descent Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:pwindsfarm@gmail.com">pwindsfarm@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>The 2002 County Land Use plan limited any possible industrial growth in the proposed area to 2000 acres. This project as planned dedicates 7200 acres, with a 22,000 acre planning horizon. Right now, industrial development according to the Draft IEC plan is at 1462 acres which is under 2000 acres. I’m not familiar enough with the 2002 County Land Use plan to know whether or not already existing industrial development is in compliance; but I will say this: large industrial projects on high water level ground close to surface water ditches and wetlands, in general, have more engineering constraints and are potentially more costly to build. And the risk of liquid spills becomes much greater because hazardous substances can reach groundwater faster and more easily; and quickly become an expensive cleanup challenge. Is the existing industrial development in compliance with the 2002 County wide plan? Does the 1462 acre figure include the roads and other concrete areas required for the development? Will the IEC plan be in compliance? Was the expansion of the boundaries of the New Carlisle Economic Development Area to 4000 acres in compliance? And how has that worked out for local people? Has there been a positive benefit in terms of permanent, uninterrupted, medium to high wage, job creation for local citizens? Has the tax increase on the area benefitted local citizens enough? Has carbon output increased or decreased as a result of the project thus far?</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:pwindsfarm@gmail.com">pwindsfarm@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>The New Carlisle town council voted that there be a moratorium on any future development that is not in line with the current (2002) plan in place let alone a new Comprehensive Land Use Plan. This is not noted in the timeline mentioned. Citizens have presented requests for an update of the County’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan. I believe the County Council and the Area Plan Commission should honor these requests as they will result in a much better outcome and fit for our community and our world.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:radiomania@juno.com">radiomania@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>The Area Management Plan did not give enough merit to the region’s farming industry. The farming industry is an integral part of the economy of the State of Indiana. As such, the region’s agricultural industry must be preserved, not eliminated. Removing vast tracts of viable farmland to create the IEC would irreparably harm our farming industry.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:radiomania@juno.com">radiomania@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>No. There is no clear limit to the boundaries of this project. As the Direct Feedback is written, there is no definitive limit to the size of the project and the amount of land and resources it would take.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:radiomania@juno.com">radiomania@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>The Vision Statement and Guiding Principles only capture the IEC’s desired outcome for development. It does not take into account the wishes and Concern / Clarity of residents of the local and regional community.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:radiomania@juno.com">radiomania@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>Little to nothing was done to advertise these public planning meetings and workshops to the public. As a result, many in the community did not know of their existence until after the fact. Public planning meeting and workshops must be clearly and widely advertised to the public months in advance so that all who are interested in participating may have an opportunity to do so.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:radiomania@juno.com">radiomania@juno.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Residents of the local and regional community who were against the IEC have been completely shut out of the planning process. Many of these residents have valid Concern / Claritys about the project's impact on the environment and their quality of life. Those who developed the IEC plan have glossed over these issues at best and provided no concrete guarantees that the project would not negatively impact the environment or the residents' quality of life. Concrete and legally binding guarantees must be put in place and be abided by in order for a project of this magnitude to go forward. It is imperative that this project not endanger the environment or the lives and safety of residents. If the IEC cannot guarantee 100% protection from damage to the environment and local quality of life, then the project must be abandoned.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rahumbarger27@gmail.com">rahumbarger27@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>No they do not. What needs to be considered is that it would force us to leave our homes and there are plenty of run down areas and abandoned buildings in south bend that could be used instead.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rahumbarger27@gmail.com">rahumbarger27@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>No, it seems like the IEC is hiding their plan from us.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rahumbarger27@gmail.com">rahumbarger27@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>Not at all! They need to take into account the people who they will be negatively affecting. We will lose their beautiful farmland with rich soil that has been passed down for generations, our homes where we, our parents, grandparents, and great grandparents grew up and we will lose the hard work we put into making them our own. They need to look past their wallets because there are much more important things than us leaving so you can build a smelly factory and line your pockets. You people should be ashamed of yourselves.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rahumbarger27@gmail.com">rahumbarger27@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>St. Joseph County should be putting more effort into fixing the abandoned buildings and run-down areas than ruining our farmland to make more. There is absolutely no need for more business.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rahumbarger27@gmail.com">rahumbarger27@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>Yes. There needs to be more public input on whether the people living in this are actually want this to happen (hint: we do not).</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rclark@saintmarys.edu">rclark@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>3/18/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>The fact is, the IEC wants this particular land because Chicago is nearby, and there is a big highway that can bring trucks here easily, making convenient trade routes for their industry. The plan talks about this. We don’t WANT masses of trucks.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rclark@saintmarys.edu">rclark@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>3/18/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>We need responsible community development in Saint Joseph County. It must really protect farms, open space, and the environment, and respect the well established communities of the people and their life style.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rclark@saintmarys.edu">rclark@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>3/18/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>We need responsible community development in Saint Joseph County. It must really protect farms, open space, and the environment, and respect the well established communities of the people and their life style.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rclark@saintmarys.edu">rclark@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>3/18/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Chapter 3: Concern / Claritying Bendix Woods and Spicer Nature Preserve: The plan says that preserving the chain of lakes is a priority. What about the aquifer? There seems to be an assumption that industrial pollution stops at the fence at the edge of an industrial plant. Nothing is farther from the truth. The aquifer connects all the water of the area—when once it’s polluted, goodbye to the wetlands, the pure lakes, and the unpolluted farmland.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rclark@saintmarys.edu">rclark@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>3/18/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Chapter 3: Concern / Claritying Bendix Woods and Spicer Nature Preserve: The plan says that preserving the chain of lakes is a priority. What about the aquifer? There seems to be an assumption that industrial pollution stops at the fence at the edge of an industrial plant. Nothing is farther from the truth. The aquifer connects all the water of the area—when once it’s polluted, goodbye to the wetlands, the pure lakes, and the unpolluted farmland.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rclark@saintmarys.edu">rclark@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>3/19/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Instead of destroying the farmland near New Carlisle, it would be much better to put some industry on the west side of South Bend, where employment is needed. There’s already lots of industry in Olive Township. If the IEC plan goes through, thousands of acres of good farmland are threatened. Also the well established neighborhoods, the real community, would be destroyed.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rclark@saintmarys.edu">rclark@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>3/18/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Chapter 1: Instead of destroying the farmland near New Carlisle, it would be much better to put some industry on the west side of South Bend, where employment is needed. There’s already lots of industry in Olive Township. If the IEC plan goes through, thousands of acres of good farmland are threatened. Also the well established neighborhoods, the real community, would be destroyed.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rclark@saintmarys.edu">rclark@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>3/18/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Chapter 1: Instead of destroying the farmland near New Carlisle, it would be much better to put some industry on the west side of South Bend, where employment is needed. There’s already lots of industry in Olive Township. If the IEC plan goes through, thousands of acres of good farmland are threatened. Also the well established neighborhoods, the real community, would be destroyed.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rclark@saintmarys.edu">rclark@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>3/19/2020</td>
<td>The size of the IEC project violates the 2002 approved Comprehensive plan which says that a maximum of 2,000 acres of industrial development are allowed. The IEC, on the other hand, plans a development of 7,200 acres—the 9th largest industrial megasite in the U.S. The plan does not discuss how to deal with the increase of traffic (trucks and trains). There’s no plan for the residents that now live in the area slated for development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rclark@saintmarys.edu">rclark@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>3/18/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>5. The plan makes NO commitment about limits in the size of this project or the kind of development. Don’t trust it! There is now an approved Comprehensive County land use plan, limiting industrial development in New Carlisle to 2,000 acres. These acres are already developed. The IEC’s plan has not been made with real input from the residents (although they imply that it has).</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rclark@saintmarys.edu">rclark@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>3/18/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>The size of the IEC project violates the 2002 approved Comprehensive plan which says that a maximum of 2,000 acres of industrial development are allowed. The IEC, on the other hand, plans a development of 7,200 acres—the 9th largest industrial megasite in the U.S. The plan does not discuss how to deal with the increase of traffic (trucks and trains). There’s no plan for the residents that now live in the area slated for development.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rclark@saintmarys.edu">rclark@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>3/18/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>The size of the IEC project violates the 2002 approved Comprehensive plan which says that a maximum of 2,000 acres of industrial development are allowed. The IEC, on the other hand, plans a development of 7,200 acres—the 9th largest industrial megasite in the U.S. The plan does not discuss how to deal with the increase of traffic (trucks and trains). There’s no plan for the residents that now live in the area slated for development.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rclark@saintmarys.edu">rclark@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>3/19/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 28 calls New Carlisle “a highly desirable place to live” with “small-town charm, surrounding farmland, parks and open spaces.” What is the use of praising those qualities when the IEC project will totally destroy them? The plan says IEC will protect the area’s “ecological assets.” That would be totally impossible! The project puts the aquifer in danger of pollution, for a start. The plan says “preserving the county’s agricultural land is a key priority.” Well, it isn’t! This excellent farmland will be destroyed forever.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rclark@saintmarys.edu">rclark@saintmarys.edu</a></td>
<td>3/18/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>It’s clear from the plan that, no matter how they put it, the IEC cares NOTHING for the residents, the farmland, the animals, the birds, the insects—all the parts that go to make up a sustainable ecological area which ought to be preserved to grow food to feed us all in the future. That future may be very near!</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>As discussed below the county should put a permanent moratorium on this project given the pending public health crisis. Millions of Americans have lost their incomes, hundreds of thousands are fighting for their lives during an unprecedented public health crisis. So many people I know who had planned to take part in these vital comments could not do so because of the ways lives have been impacted during this crisis. The county should suspend any further developments on this project until after the Covid-19 crisis when people could meaningfully participate in this process.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a huge competitive advantage of the New Carlisle area that was not focused on - the community. It's not just the town saying, New Carlisle is a nice place to visit and great place to live. The community itself should be held up as an asset in considering how to develop the area. New Carlisle is a great place to live, in no small part to our natural environment and quiet, small town way of life. It is an amazing place to grow up (like I did, from age 4 on) and a great place to raise a family. New Carlisle has historically been a bedroom community where workers from other cities move because they are attracted to the quiet natural setting and small town way of life. A sustainable growth plan for the town would probably mirror recent campaigns in states like Vermont and Montana that have investing in attracting high-paying jobs through public ad campaigns to encourage teleworking from those states. Likewise, the county could use the new high-speed internet grant to invest in high tech solutions for existing family farmers and encourage more high tech remote workers to move to New Carlisle. As more and more jobs can be done remotely, and more people are beginning to leave big cities in search of a more thoughtful way of life, the county should spend the money it’s been using to attract dirty, outdated industry to instead capitalize on the resources New Carlisle has to offer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>As briefly mentioned above, another community and regional asset to highlight is New Carlisle's natural environment and close proximity to state parks, and Lake Michigan (along with a brand new National Park). The plan touts the proximity to Lake Michigan and Chicago only to demonstrate that there are available logistics and transport options for businesses, the plan overlooks these resources and assets themselves for attracting a different kind of development. The New Carlisle area is better suited to eco-tourism and other tourist industries than it is suited for large format industrial uses. The two uses are not exactly comparable. No one wants to enjoy a nice vacation enjoying natural beauty of the scenery along with observing large scale industrial development. It is the exact problem the communities along the lake like Burns Harbor and Whiting have already fallen prey to. Large polluting industries like the BP refinery lured the town with the promise of future taxes at the expense of the natural environment, pushing tourists further along lake Michigan and up to New Buffalo. New Carlisle is only a short drive from the lake and the new national park. And with other nearby natural attractions like Hudson Lake, Spicer Lake, and Bendix Woods, and a short drive to restaurants, bars and other cultural attractions in Southwestern Michigan, Michigan City and South Bend, it is an ideal tourist destination. The county should focus on supporting our small businesses and farmers in order to ensure the community continues to have robust small business to support these tourists. Make the thousands of dollars spent on the ad campaign that attempts to sell the IEC available to small businesses on our main street in order to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>It is also worth noting that the county is attempting to move forward with the IEC by getting the plan approved before identify specific sources that will come to the IEC, or if those sources have been secured, the county has not made any of their businesses public. In doing so, the county is attempting to secure re-zoning without drawing attention to the polluters who intend to locate at the IEC. The county is touting “high tech jobs” without concrete mention of the types of industries it wishes to attract. It is also likely that some of the high tech jobs the county now touts would not consider locating at the IEC because the area lacks the proper education base in high tech, high skilled jobs. In the way that the deal with Toyota fell through, the county is hiding behind generalities of the kinds of industries they would like to see locate here, without the guarantee they can secure them. After they secure the re-zoning, this would allow any high polluting industry that requires a lot of water use for their industrial processes to locate at the IEC after the re-zoning has been secured. The county should not move forward to approve this plan in the abstract. It should take comment on a plan that includes that actual source categories and industries that it would like to permit on this large swath of land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:reflullmer@gmail.com">reflullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>The county’s attempt to select future business purposes and industry pillars for this broad swatch of land, thousands of acres - most of it already being utilized in a business purpose as agricultural land - falls flat. Agribusiness is the most appropriate pillar selected given most of the land’s current status as working farmland. However, if the county was serious about attracting agribusiness, most of those uses would not need an “industrial” zoning classification. It is likely that the county is more interested in attracting metals manufacturing and agricem production rather than true agricultural business uses, for most of which the land could maintain its current zoning status and ownership. Once again the county’s attempts to categorize future uses of a massive amount of land dedicated to existing uses in the community demonstrates the top-down approach taken throughout this process. The county has given no consideration to any alternatives, including a no-action alternative for this site that allowed existing agricultural land to remain in tact and assessing the viability of alternative sites at previously developed locations elsewhere in the county. The other “business uses that should be considered for the area” are obvious - consideration of allowing the remaining uses to remain in tact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>The county should give consideration to restricting uses within the larger IEC plan. A mix of natural areas, agricultural zones, commercial zones, retail zones, and some addition to the existing industrial zoning was not even considered as an alternative plan. It is easy to see how the county may have developed reasonable alternatives that considered the merits of various mixed use plans for thousands of acres, this kind of approach would have been much more logical. Instead, the county took an arbitrary approach including only the consideration of one alternative that proposes the immediate conversion of thousands of existing agricultural land directly to land zoned for the heaviest industrial uses. A multi-thousand acre, all-industrial push makes no sense and is demonstrative of the underlying arbitrary decisionmaking process. The county should consider several development alternatives, including plans that re-zone land as only commercial and retail, and plans that only slightly expand existing industrial zoning. Only the extreme, all-industrial scenario has been assessed here. The failure to assess any other rational alternatives is further evidence that the county is not interested in the most natural ways to expand and develop the community, and instead is hoping to re-zone as many acres as possible by using post hoc rationalizations to support the foregone conclusion the county had at the outset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>If the county declines to restrict or prohibit heavy industrial uses that threaten the public health and wellbeing of New Carlisle residents, the county should set aside the funding for a county prosector charged with enforcing environmental laws in the IEC including our nation's clean air and clean water laws. A recent report from the Environmental Law and Policy Center that looked at enforcement by EPA across region 5 found a significant lack of enforcement of basic environmental laws. Polluters are by and large policing themselves and this has resulted in an increase in air pollution nationally for the fourth year in a row according to the American Lung Associations 2020 State of the Air Report. If the county welcomes industrial polluters into New Carlisle, the county should promise the community that it will at least attempt to enforce our bedrock environmental protections. Without a dedicated county prosector to police polluters, the people of New Carlisle will be left with no meaningful safeguards from pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>Third, this plan needs a real transparency effort and public accountability. The county commissioners have attempted to insulate themselves from political accountability and political consequences by appointing a non-elected board to make the development decisions related to the IEC. This is inappropriate. The commissioners should dissolve the development subcommittee and make all decisions related to the IEC on their own accord. They may take recommendation and read reports developed by the development subcommittee, but the final decisions on the IEC must remain with publicly accountable actors who people can recall, vote out of office, or support when they make good decisions. The undemocratic selection/appointment of the development board is just another in a long line of process violations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>Finally, it is shocking that the county is driving this plan forward in the midst of an unprecedented public health crisis. The county should put a moratorium on all plans and extend all public comment periods until after the crisis is abated. Many members of the community are dealing with extraneous circumstances due to loss of life, loss of income, and remote child care obligations during this world crisis. The county continued the comment period, only only by a few weeks, not enough for those who are the most vulnerable to meaningful engage in this comment period. The comment period on this plan should be re-opened until after the crisis abates and no further steps should be taken in the meantime. People are struggling. They should not have to worry about the shadowy decisions being undertaken by the county under cover of the Covid-19 crisis. Shame on you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Growth and development are essential to all communities. However, the county is giving almost no consideration to the values that New Carlisle residents care about when thinking of the growth and development of their own community. This plan looks at only one town as a way to expand and grow the tax base of an entire county. The county has concluded New Carlisle would be the best place for antiquated, large format development and has worked backwards from that conclusion. It is nonsensical to come into a small, deeply-rooted, and close-knit community with the message that outsiders from the county who do not live or work in New Carlisle know what's best for the area. It is clearly a plan developed by an outside audience for an outside audience. A real plan for growth and development of Saint Joe County would look at several proposed sites around the county, as well as no action alternatives, deeply consider what kind of businesses have the best chances to thrive in a particular area, and then take comment on those different alternatives. Here, the plan starts with the conclusion 'large format industrial development is best in New Carlisle' and works backwards to fill in the details in a way that sounds appealing. A true plan for growth and development for New Carlisle would start with what values matter most to the community - a thriving main street, investing in locally owned businesses, increased funding for public education, and existing roads and infrastructure, protecting and enhancing our air and water. It’s not just the town saying - New Carlisle is a great place to live, in no small part to our natural environment and quiet, small town way of life. A sustainable growth plan for the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>The county should put a permanent moratorium on this project given the pending public health and financial crisis. Millions of Americans have lost their incomes, hundreds of thousands are fighting for their lives during an unprecedented public health crisis. So many people I know who had planned to take part in these vital comments could not do so because of the ways lives have been impacted during this crisis. The county should suspend any further developments on this project until after the Covid-19 crisis when people could meaningfully participate in this process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>As briefly mentioned above, another community and regional asset to highlight is New Carlisle's natural environment and close proximity to state parks, and Lake Michigan (along with a brand new National Park). The plan touts the proximity to Lake Michigan and Chicago only to demonstrate that there are available logistics and transport options for businesses, the plan overlooks these resources and assets themselves for attracting a different kind of development. The New Carlisle area is better suited to eco-tourism and other tourist industries than it is suited for large format industrial uses. The two uses are not exactly comparable. No one wants to enjoy a nice vacation enjoying natural beauty of the scenery along with observing large scale industrial development. It is the exact problem the communities along the lake like Burns Harbor and Whiting have already fallen prey to. Large polluting industries like the BP refinery lured the town with the promise of future taxes at the expense of the natural environment, pushing tourists further along lake Michigan and up to New Buffalo. New Carlisle is only a short drive from the lake and the new national park. And with other nearby natural attractions like Hudson Lake, Spicer Lake, and Bendix Woods, and a short drive to restaurants, bars and other cultural attractions in Southwestern Michigan, Michigan City and...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>The county must undertake an additional and through environmental assessment of the air and water resources. The water use issues associated with development in this area are paramount, and the county must spend much more time assessing the surface water and groundwater issues at the proposed site. The areas selected for the IEC has a rare, unconfined aquifer. Industrial wastewater often contains traces of heavy metals, hazardous pollutants, and often emerging chemical of Concern / Clarity like PFAS or PFOA-compounds. Part III includes a cursory assessment of the existing environmental resources, but gives no meaningful consideration of alternatives to development and makes no serious attempts to project the strain that would be placed on these resources by an industrial development of this size. The projections for the IEC place this as the 9th largest industrial park in the United States, an assessment of the strain on the natural resources for a site that large must be much more robust and include actual assessments of the public health impact of the pollution that would follow such development. There is no assessment of the community's existing pollution burden or an attempt to determine what kind of health related changes would follow from such large scale development. The plan...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>As described above the plan includes no studies that look at the future pollution burden on residents or provide an assessment of public health outcomes. The county should do comparison studies that look at the before and after burdens of areas of the US containing the 8th and 10th largest industrial developments at the very least as comparison studies. The plan should also consider the impact of the loss of cultural resources on the community and assess the impact on the town from loss of farmland. The plan is also missing a robust transportation study that makes sound projections on the increase in truck and freight truck traffic associated with this development. Without providing the actual industries that the county intends to site here, giving specifics about the industries that will be included and the processes conducted on site, there is no way to accurately project those increases in traffic and increase in transportation related air emissions. The county must also consider the increase in traffic fatalities and pay special attention to the fact that the public high school is located in between highways 2 and 20 with no stop light on either entrance to to the school road. This scenario means that when coming from LaPorte County, or coming from New Carlisle high school drivers must cross incoming, non-yielding traffic to get to school and...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>The county’s attempt to select future business purposes and industry pillars for this broad swatch of land, thousands of acres - most of it already being utilized in a business purpose as agricultural land - falls flat. Agribusiness is the most appropriate pillar selected given most of the land’s current status as working farmland. However, if the county was serious about attracting agribusiness, most of those uses would not need an “industrial” zoning classification. It is likely that the county is more interested in attracting metals manufacturing and argichem production rather than true agricultural business uses, for most of which the land could maintain its current zoning status and ownership. Once again, the county’s attempts to categorize future uses of a massive amount of land dedicated to existing uses in the community demonstrates the topdown approach taken throughout this process. The county has given no consideration to any alternatives, including a no-action alternative for this site that allowed existing agricultural land to remain intact and assessing the viability of alternative sites at previously developed locations elsewhere in the county. The other “business uses that should be considered for the area” are obvious - consideration of allowing the remaining uses to remain intact. The county should give consideration to restricting uses within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>The county has not done any meaningful due diligence on this project.</td>
<td>The county has not done any meaningful due diligence on this project. The county has come to an arbitrary and capricious conclusion and has worked backwards from that. First, the county has not given a single meaningful alternative to this development plan and the selection of New Carlisle as the future home of the IEC. Rather than choosing multiple sites for development or re-development all over the county and then proposing several meaningful alternative sites for future development, the county has selected one preferred site, in New Carlisle, and has attempted to work backwards from that conclusion in an attempt to justify development there, regardless of community Concern / Clarity or input. The county should throw out everything about this plan and start from scratch looking at the entire county for the selection of suitable development sites. When considering alternative sites around the county, the county should give priority to alternatives that re-develop and remediate old industrial sites or incorporate brownfield redevelopment into site alternatives. There should be a particularly high bar to selecting an undeveloped site of virgin farmland for industrial re-zoning. The farmland outside New Carlisle is some of the nations most productive land, and as such it should be a low priority area for industrial source siting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>Another huge competitive advantage that is overlooked is the natural environment and close proximity to state parks, and Lake Michigan (along with a brand new National Park). The New Carlisle area is better suited to eco-tourism and other tourist industries than it is suited for large format industrial uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>The county must undertake an additional and through environmental assessment of the air and water resources. The water use issues associated with development in this area are paramount, and the county must spend much more time assessing the surface water and groundwater issues at the proposed site. The areas selected for the IEC has a rare, unconfined aquifer. Industrial wastewater often contains traces of heavy metals, hazardous pollutants, and often emerging chemical of Concern / Clarity like PFAS or PFOA-compounds. Part III includes a cursory assessment of the existing environmental resources, but gives no meaningful consideration of alternatives to development and makes no serious attempts to project the strain that would be placed on these resources by an industrial development of this size. The projections for the IEC place this as the 9th largest industrial park in the United States, an assessment of the strain on the natural resources for a site that large must be much more robust and include actual assessments of the public health impact of the pollution that would follow such development. There is no assessment of the community’s existing pollution burden or an attempt to determine what kind of health related changes would follow from such large scale development. The plan includes a cursory assessment of the area’s attainment status for a few criteria pollutions and looks at some existing groundwater withdrawal, it does no due diligence to project what the future need might look like and how that could impact public health outcomes in the area. Without full transparency over what kind of sources would be located at the IEC, the community give meaningful public...</td>
</tr>
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<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
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<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>As described above the plan includes no studies that look at the future pollution burden on residents or provide an assessment of public health outcomes. The county should do comparison studies that look at the before and after burdens of areas of the US containing the 8th and 10th largest industrial developments at the very least as comparison studies. The plan should also consider the impact of the loss of cultural resources on the community and assess the impact on the town from loss of farm land. The plan is also missing a robust transportation study that makes sound projections on the increase in truck and freight truck traffic associated with this development. Without providing the actual industries that the county intends to site here, giving specifics about the industries that will be included and the processes conducted on site, there is no way to accurately project those increases in traffic and increase in transportation related air emissions. The county must also consider the increase in traffic fatalities and pay special attention to the fact that the public high school is located in between highways 2 and 20 with no stop light on either entrance to to the school road. This scenario means that when coming from LaPorte County, or coming from New Carlisle high school drivers must cross incoming, non-yielding traffic to get to school and leave school everyday. The traffic study must consider these community specific details and provide more than a cursory assessment of these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>Fourth, as described below, the county has not given proper importance to the maintenance of our clean air and clean water. The county needs to engage with residents in a meaningful way on an environmental impact assessment to ensure full weight is given to the ecological impacts. Likewise the county needs to conduct an assess the impact of this project on the New Carlisle community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
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<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>Second, the county has not conducted a single meaningful environmental impact assessment, and has only discussed the wastewater, groundwater and surface water issues in an extremely cursory fashion. If the county refuses to consider many alternatives to this plan, it should, at the very least, conduct a thorough environment impact study before any more land is developed or even re-zoned. The county is, in particular, in a rush to purchase and re-zone land in an attempt to rush the project along. No land should be re-zoned for industrial use until after the county has done a thorough environmental assessment that looks carefully at impacts on the entire natural ecosystem, including groundwater and surface water resources, air-shed projections, including worse case scenarios for hazardous air pollution and criteria air pollution including projections of future industrial sources as well as projections of increased freight truck traffic to and from the development area.</td>
</tr>
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<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>Third, the water use issues associated with development in this area are paramount, and the county must spend much more time assessing the surface water and groundwater issues at the proposed site. The areas selected for the IEC has a rare, unconfined aquifer. Industrial wastewater often contains traces of heavy metals, hazardous pollutants, and often emerging chemical of Concern / Clarity like PFAS or PFOA-compounds. Under the Supreme Court’s recent decision in County of Maui v Hawaii Wildlife fund, injecting even partially treated industrial waste water into groundwater, or releasing back over land known to have direct groundwater connections to a navigable surface water will run afoul of the Court’s new precedent as being the functional equivalent as a discharge into navigable waters. This means it is likely that any industrial source looking to heavily use and discharge groundwater needs to seek a clean water act permit. The county should not wait until a series of industrial groundwater users overwhelm and pollute one of the largest fresh water aquifers in the county, instead the county should do a thorough groundwater study before even re-zoning any parcel of agricultural land. In lieu of these studies, the county should propose a covenant that runs in perpetuity with the land in each of these IEC tracts that prohibits any industrial users from withdrawing and discharging over a certain threshold of water from the aquifer. This kind of permanent covenant could assuage Concern / Claritys that the county is seeking to attract heavily-polluting industry sources (petro-chem, argro-chem, metals manufacturing) that would almost certainly seek to consume, large or unlimited quantities of groundwater.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The area boundaries are clear and concise, but again the county has given us one option for the boundaries of this project. There has been no selection of alternative sites, and not even the consideration of multiple site boundary areas. This is an arbitrary and capricious starting point for a major decision like the 9th largest industrial complex in the United States. The county should conduct a robust assessment of site locations across the county with priority going towards the redevelopment of existing industrial tracts, including the remediation and re-use of brownfield sites across the county. The county should consider many various options for sites and only after doing so, should consider many options for site boundaries at a given finalist location. The fact that the county has preset the borders before even taking public comment on whether the New Carlisle area is in fact the best suited location for a large format industrial site demonstrates the arbitrary nature of the decision-making. The county has begun the process by selecting a preferred alternative, and then invested thousands of taxpayer dollars into working backwards to justify the conclusion they have started with. To explain this process to someone unfamiliar with the IEC is a lesson in bad government. The county has spent a lot of money to develop post hoc rationalizations for its initial conclusion that
<table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>The vision statement and guiding principals completely overlook the fact that the local community does not want to house one of the largest industrial developments in the country. The values of the community have been totally overlooked since day one, and there has been no consideration of alternatives for site-selection or consideration of a no action alternative that pursues development by investing in the community in a way that is organic and driven by the values of folks actually living and working in New Carlisle. To properly evaluate whether the right vision and guiding principals have been assessed, the county should convene a board of New Carlisle residents with authority to veto any aspects of the plan that are not in line with the kind of development that the town wants to pursue. The members of the board should be democratically elected by all residents of New Carlisle and politically accountable, requiring re-election and serving limited terms. In addition to giving full consideration to the values prioritized by residents, the plan should prioritize site development options that are in line with the environmental and sustainability development realities of the twenty-first century. Specifically, the IEC lots should be limited to new green sectors, including industries primarily related to green technology such as wind or solar arrays, and other green, high-skilled jobs that draw graduates from the many excellent colleges and universities in the region.</td>
</tr>
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<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>The area boundaries are clear and concise, but again the county has given us one option for the boundaries of this project. There has been no selection of alternative sites, and not even the consideration of multiple site boundary areas. This is an arbitrary and capricious starting point for a major decision like the 9th largest industrial complex in the United States. The county should conduct a robust assessment of site locations across the county with priority going towards the redevelopment of existing industrial tracts, including the remediation and re-use of brownfield sites across the county. The county should consider many various options for sites and only after doing so, should consider many options for site boundaries at a given finalist location. The fact that the county has preset the borders before even taking public comment on whether the New Carlisle area is in fact the best suited location for a large format industrial site demonstrates the arbitrary nature of the decision-making. The county has begun the process by selecting a preferred alternative, and then invested thousands of taxpayer dollars into working backwards to justify the conclusion they have started with. To explain this process to someone unfamiliar with the IEC is a lesson in bad government. The county has spent a lot of money to develop post hoc rationalizations for its initial conclusion that an industrial park should be sited in New Carlisle regardless of community support or sentiment. It is a total disgrace to our democratic processes for the county officials to show privately held tracts of land, currently in use as working farmland as the selected site location for a future industrial park without considering any other alternative sites.</td>
</tr>
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<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>The county has not done any meaningful due diligence on this project. The county has come to an arbitrary and capricious conclusion and has worked backwards from that. First, the county has not given a single meaningful alternative to this development plan and the selection of New Carlisle as the future home of the IEC. Rather than choosing multiple sites for development or re-development all over the county and then proposing several meaningful alternative sites for future development, the county has selected one preferred site, in New Carlisle, and has attempted to work backwards from that conclusion in an attempt to justify development there, regardless of community Concern / Clarity or input. The county should throw out everything about this plan and start from scratch looking at the entire county for the selection of suitable development sites. When considering alternative sites around the county, the county should give priority to alternatives that re-develop and remediate old industrial sites or incorporate brownfield redevelopment into site alternatives. There should be a particularly high bar to selecting an undeveloped site of virgin farmland for industrial re-zoning. The farmland outside New Carlisle is some of the nations most productive land, and as such it should be a low priority area for industrial source siting.</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Likewise, as mentioned in Chapter V below, the county should consider protective covenants that run with the land in the IEC that set aside conservation easements and restrict certain uses at the IEC sites. The county should also consider covenant that prevent industrial users from withdrawing and discharging over a certain threshold of water from the aquifer. This kind of permanent covenant could assuage Concern / Clarity that the county is seeking to attract heavily-polluting industry sources (petro-chem, agro-chem, metals manufacturing) that would almost certainly seek to consume, large or unlimited quantities of groundwater. The County could devise a covenant as a condition of use in these IEC tracts that protects groundwater resources that the citizens of New Carlisle care most about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>The county should also consider restrictions on other uses of the land including restricting and prohibiting permit applications to build for users from heavily polluting sectors - including petro-chem, agro-chem, and other industrial uses where hazardous chemicals and compounds would be handled or stored on site. The county should prohibit any industrial use that would make the owner or operator of the site subject to the reporting requirements for hazardous chemical storage and handling under the Clean Air Act’s Risk Management Program, also known as the Chemical Disaster rule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>As mentioned above, the county restrict certain uses at the IEC sites and set aside large natural tracts with conservation easements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First, the county should consider restrictive use covenants that run with the land in the IEC that and specifically requirements related to water use and wastewater discharge. The IEC could restrict industrial users from withdrawing and discharging over a certain threshold of water from the aquifer. This kind of permanent covenant could begin to address Concern / Clarities about the types of industrial sources the county is attempting to attract (petro-chem, agro-chem, metals manufacturing,) that would almost certainly seek to consume, large or unlimited quantities of groundwater. The County could devise a covenant as a condition of use in these IEC tracts that protects groundwater resources that the citizens of New Carlisle care most about.

Second, regardless of groundwater and surface water restrictions, the county should also consider restrictions on other uses of the land including restricting and prohibiting permit applications to build for users from heavily polluting sectors - including petro-chem, agro-chem, gas processing, chemicals refining and other industrial uses where hazardous chemicals and chemical byproducts would be handled or stored on site. The county should prohibit any industrial use that would make the owner or operator of the site subject to the reporting requirements for hazardous chemical storage and handling under the Clean Air Act’s Section 112(r) Risk Management Plan program, also known as the Chemical Disaster rule.

The County should also pursue options to restrict uses by limiting the lots to new green sectors, including industries primarily related to green technology such as wind or solar arrays, and other green, high-skilled jobs that draw graduates from the many excellent colleges and universities in the region.
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<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>The vision statement and guiding principles completely overlook the fact that the local community does not want to house one of the largest industrial developments in the country. The values of the community have been totally overlooked since day one, and there has been no consideration of alternatives for site-selection or consideration of a no action alternative that pursues development by investing in the community in a way that is organic and driven by the values of folks actually living and working in New Carlisle. To properly evaluate whether the right vision and guiding principals have been assessed, the county should convene a board of New Carlisle residents with authority to veto any aspects of the plan that are not in line with the kind of development that the town wants to pursue. The members of the board should be democratically elected by all residents of New Carlisle and politically accountable, requiring reelection and serving limited terms. In addition to giving full consideration to the values prioritized by residents, the plan should prioritize site development options that are in line with the environmental and sustainability development realities of the twenty-first century.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| reflulmer@gmail.com | 4/27/2020|          | It is disingenuous to say there has been “confusion” about the outreach process. The county has purposefully obfuscated the process to prevent meaningful public input at early stages of the process so that the county can generate momentum by claiming the IEC is a done deal. As discussed in my answer to Section V below, more public input and transparency is needed in all phases of assessing this project. The entire scoping phase of this project has been riddled with process violations and purposeful attempts to limit public input. All aspects of this plan have been arbitrarily decided and not communicated with members of the community until after the fact or with almost no notice. One example is the way the county has conducted meetings where decisions are being made, or determinative votes are being cast. Most meetings on this plan where the decisions have been made have been held at the county building during work hours. This has made meaningful community input almost impossible. New Carlisle residents, who never asked for the community to be selected for large format industrial development should not take vacation hours or days off work simply to comment on this public project. Meetings should be held after work hours at 7pm, or 7:30 pm to allow full community participation. Many meetings, including the one I was able to...
refullmer@gmail.com

4/27/2020

Every aspect of this plan requires much more public input. Almost all of the County’s attempts at public outreach have failed, and for most aspects of this plan it has been too, little too late. The way the county has conducted the entire scoping phase of the project has been riddled with process violations. All aspects of this plan have been arbitrarily decided and not communicated with members of the community until after the fact or with almost no notice. First, most of the meetings on this plan where the decisions have been made have been held at the county building during work hours. This has made meaningful community input almost impossible. New Carlisle residents, who never asked for the community to be selected for large format industrial development should not take vacation hours or days off work simply to comment on the project. Meetings should be held after work hours at 7, or 7:30 pm to allow full community participation. Many meetings, including the one I was able to take a vacation day to speak at, have been held during the middle of the day. Should we really be asking nurses and school teachers be taking vacation days to speak out for their community? It’s an appalling attempt at a lack of transparency. It is also important to note that many residents of New Carlisle work just a few miles west, in LaPorte county, which goes on...
<table>
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<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>There is a huge competitive advantage of the New Carlisle area that was not focused on - the community. It’s not just the town saying, New Carlisle is a nice place to visit and great place to live. The community itself should be held up as an asset in considering how to develop the area. New Carlisle is a great place to live, in no small part to our natural environment and quiet, small town way of life. It is an amazing place to grow up (like I did, from age 4 on) and a great place to raise a family. New Carlisle has historically been a bedroom community where workers from other cities move because they are attracted to the quiet natural setting and small town way of life. A sustainable growth plan for the town would probably mirror recent campaigns in states like Vermont and Montana that have investing in attracting high-paying jobs through public ad campaigns to encourage teleworking from those states. Likewise, the county could use the new high speed internet grant to invest in high tech solutions for existing family farmers and encourage more high tech remote workers to move to New Carlisle. As more and more jobs can be done remotely, and more people are beginning to leave big cities in search of a more thoughtful way of life, the county should spend the money it’s been using to attract dirty, outdated industry to instead capitalize on the resources New Carlisle already has and the values that matter most to the folks who already live here. New Carlisle is a vibrant, close knit community where people want to live, and the county should prioritize development that builds on what we already have, not destroys those values in search of profit by other means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>As mentioned throughout this comment, the county should create a board of New Carlisle residents with the authority to veto any action taken in the development of the IEC. The board of New Carlisle residents should include several seats chosen by election and including current elected town representatives. If the county continues to move forward with this project, the board of New Carlisle residents should have final veto power over each and every transaction for the final siting of sources, including final say on each permit, zoning decision, and contract to purchase land.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
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<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>It is disingenuous to say there has been “confusion” about the outreach process. The county has purposefully obfuscated the process to prevent meaningful public input at early stages of the process so that the county can generate momentum by claiming the IEC is a done deal. As discussed in my answer to Section V below, more public input and transparency is needed in all phases of assessing this project. The entire scoping phase of this project has been riddled with process violations and purposeful attempts to limit public input. All aspects of this plan have been arbitrarily decided and not communicated with members of the community until after the fact or with almost no notice. One example is the way the county has conducted meetings where decisions are being made, or determinative votes are being cast. Most meetings on this plan where the decisions have been made have been held at the county building during work hours. This has made meaningful community input almost impossible. New Carlisle residents, who never asked for the community to be selected for large format industrial development should not take vacation hours or days off work simply to comment on this public project. Meetings should be held after work hours at 7pm, or 7:30 pm to allow full community participation. Many meetings, including the one I was able to take a vacation day to speak at, have been held during the middle of the day. My mother, who lives in New Carlisle and is very involved in the community has never been able to attend a meeting where a vote has been cast to speak out because they have all happened while she is at work. She is a nurse - should we really be asking nurses and school teachers be taking vacation...</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>Importantly, if the County insists on continuing to expend time and public funds on this project during the current public health crisis, there should be numerous public hearings where any interested resident can dial into a videoconference and speak at virtual public hearings to give testimony to the development board and county commissioners. No one should have to jeopardize their health and wellbeing to exercise their rights to speak at a public hearing. The county should give serious consideration to ways to make this process remotely accessible to all residents while respecting CDC social distancing guidelines, including both telephone and video format.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>As discussed below The county should put a permanent moratorium on this project given the pending public health crisis. Millions of Americans have lost their incomes, hundreds of thousands are fighting for their lives during an unprecedented public health crisis. So many people I know who had planned to take part in these vital comments could not do so because of the ways lives have been impacted during this crisis. The county should suspend any further developments on this project until after the Covid-19 crisis when people could meaningfully participate in this process.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>Every aspect of this plan requires much more public input. Almost all of the County’s attempts at public outreach have failed, and for most aspects of this plan it has been too, little too late. The way the county has conducted the entire scoping phase of the project has been riddled with process violations. All aspects of this plan have been arbitrarily decided and not communicated with members of the community until after the fact or with almost no notice. First, most of the meetings on this plan where the decisions have been made have been held at the county building during work hours. This has made meaningful community input almost impossible. New Carlisle residents, who never asked for the community to be selected for large format industrial development should not take vacation hours or days off work simply to comment on the project. Meetings should be held after work hours at 7, or 7:30 pm to allow full community participation. Many meetings, including the one I was able to take a vacation day to speak at, have been held during the middle of the day. Should we really be asking nurses and school teachers be taking vacation days to speak out for their community? It’s an appalling attempt at a lack of transparency. It is also important to note that many residents of New Carlisle work just a few miles west, in LaPorte county which goes on Central Time. Choosing a later time like 7 or 7:30 pm would allow those residents that work until 5 or 6 central time to drive all the way to South Bend and participate.</td>
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<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>Second, it is not enough to invite public input (as the county truly has not done yet based on the barriers to public input described above) the county must build in meaningful decision points that turn on community input. The County should create a board of New Carlisle residents with the authority to veto any action taken in the development of the IEC. The board of New Carlisle residents should include elected town representatives and several more seats that are voted on by everyone in the town of New Carlisle, (including residents on the LaPorte County side of the road). If the county continues to move forward with this project, the board of New Carlisle residents should have final veto power over each and every transaction for the final siting of sources, including final say on each permit, zoning decision, and contract to purchase land.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:refullmer@gmail.com">refullmer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>Fourth, as described in the answer above, the county should create a board of New Carlisle residents residents with the authority to veto any action taken in the development of the IEC. The board of New Carlisle residents should include several seats chosen by election and including current elected town representatives. If the county continues to move forward with this project, the board of New Carlisle residents should have final veto power over each and every transaction for the final siting of sources, including final say on each permit, zoning decision, and contract to purchase land.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rileythompsonusa@gmail.com">rileythompsonusa@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Much of the plan seems dependent on attracting more people to the area to support a workforce. New Carlisle has long been desirable &amp; the value/quality of homes built in the area are reflective of that. The IEC does not seem to be understanding that having an eyesore of an industrial park is going to hurt residential investment in the area. It would seem wise to not allow further development WEST of Walnut road. New Carlisle will not stay as nice as it is if there is not good insulation from the industrial park. There are woods south of Edison road that are being logged and thinned out, which is exposing valuable neighborhoods, such as Stone Oak Estates, to the industrial park. The area north of Edison road is already an eyesore for New Carlisle neighborhoods looking east, due to lack of forestation. Homes and land in New Carlisle have traditionally been very sought after by families looking to move in, particularly in the last 30 years. This is because of New Carlisle's clean, small-town feel &amp; good schools. Nobody wants an industrial park near a home that costs over $300-$500K (see the Stone Oak neighborhood). If property owners see the desirability of their homes and land plummet, anticipate lawsuits.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rileythompsonusa@gmail.com">rileythompsonusa@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2/28/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>If there are other industrial mega sites in the US that do not depend on robust aquifers, it doesn't make sense that the aquifer in this New Carlisle site is being listed as a competitive advantage. Rather, it would seem that the aquifer in this site should be protected at all costs. Put another way, of all the places to develop an industrial site, why put it right on top of such a significant, natural feature? St. Joseph County and its residents do not need this development more than we need clean and unpolluted water.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rileythompsonusa@gmail.com">rileythompsonusa@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2/26/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>The concept areas are pushing too close to New Carlisle residential areas, particularly area C. You must not disrupt the woods in that area because they are helping to insulate the town's residential areas from the eyesore of an industrial park. There are neighborhoods that have valuable homes and I'm already hearing that people who have been marketing their homes for sale are seeing causes for Concern / Clarity over their resale values. Also, the section for concept area D doesn't even make mention of the Bendix Woods park, which is a negligence on the planner's part.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rileythompsonusa@gmail.com">rileythompsonusa@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2/28/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>I've been looking over the recently released IEC plans and I'm Concern / Clarityed about how close the core development areas are to some of New Carlisle's nicest neighborhoods. In particular, the area north of Edison Road and West of Walnut Road is mapped to be directly adjacent to a newer home development. As a resident, I would suggest limiting plans to develop west of Walnut Road (particularly the woods south of Edison Road) so we aren't causing those well-established residential areas to lose desirability.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rileythompsonusa@gmail.com">rileythompsonusa@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2/28/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>The area North of Edison Road and West of Walnut road is currently acting as buffer zone between the industrial area and some of New Carlisle's most popular residential areas. Particularly, there has been significant real estate investment in the areas directly WEST of Wintergreen Road. Having an industrial park become adjacent to these neighborhoods is going to negatively impact the desirability and prices of these residential properties. There is currently a residential subdivision in that area that still has many available home building sites. As a New Carlisle resident, I strongly encourage the IEC does NOT develop WEST of Walnut Road.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rileythompsonusa@gmail.com">rileythompsonusa@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2/28/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>The area south of Edison Road and west of Walnut Road is near to a religious community (Catholic Monastery) and a residential neighborhood (Stone Oak Estates). A key part of the IEC development plan hinges on New Carlisle remaining a popular (and growing) place for future families and employees to reside. To maintain a buffer area between New Carlisle and IEC, do NOT develop WEST of Walnut Road.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rileythompsonusa@gmail.com">rileythompsonusa@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2/26/2020</td>
<td>2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?</td>
<td>Concept area C is pushing way too close to a Catholic Monastery that has tried to have an organic certification for its garden. This will be disrupting the peace of that religious community as well as hurting the re-sale value of homes in that area, particularly the Stone Oak development. These have historically been very desirable housing areas and this plan is going to ruin that.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rileythompsonusa@gmail.com">rileythompsonusa@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2/26/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>The County should be focusing efforts on what was already started north of South Bend, along the bypass, as well as the industrial park in Niles.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rileythompsonusa@gmail.com">rileythompsonusa@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2/26/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>The woods between Early and Walnut roads are a very important barrier to help insulate New Carlisle's residential areas from the development. This plan is including a rail spur right through those woods and we've already seen logging to create space for power lines. If you start exposing what was once valuable residential real-estate to the eyesore of an industrial park, I would anticipate furious homeowners (and lawsuits) because of plummeting property values.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rileythompsonusa@gmail.com">rileythompsonusa@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2/28/2020</td>
<td>I've been looking over the recently released IEC plans and I'm Concern / Clarityed about how close the core development areas are to some of New Carlisle's nicest neighborhoods. In Particular, the area north of Edison Road and West of Walnut Road is mapped to be directly adjacent to a newer home development. As a resident, I would suggest limiting plans to develop west of Walnut Road (particularly the woods south of Edison Road) so we aren't causing those well-established residential areas to lose desirability.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rjclarkart@embarqmail.com">rjclarkart@embarqmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>The value of preserving natural, finite resources that can not be replaced or renewed once destroyed do not appear in the calculation. What is lost to achieve the Area Management Plan and, once gone, can it be replaced or restored?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rjclarkart@embarqmail.com">rjclarkart@embarqmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>Burns Harbor would be a much better distribution center. It has all the local plan offers plus a harbor for international trade.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rjclarkart@embarqmail.com">rjclarkart@embarqmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>The limit of 2,000 acres by the 2002 County land Use Plan has been met and exceeded and, not all businesses with in that area are &quot;active or thriving&quot; but some, like the &quot;Shredder&quot;, are actively polluting.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rjclarkart@embarqmail.com">rjclarkart@embarqmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>No, they do not. Participants in the &quot;Vision Statement and Guiding Principles&quot; statement do not reflect the whole of the residential or business community. The &quot;New Carlisle Business and Professional Association&quot; is a membership organization and not an elective body. It does not speak for or represent all the businesses or residents of New Carlisle. While few in numbers, there are large land holders, mostly farmers, with economic, environmental, a larger land use Concern / Claritys whose voices need to be heard and input considered</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rjclarkart@embarqmail.com">rjclarkart@embarqmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>Collecting information is vital for discussion but there seems to be a lack of transparency about the process, the participants and expenditures to date. The lack of transparency, calls credibility into question and creates a lack of trust, which is at issue with this plan.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rjclarkart@embarqmail.com">rjclarkart@embarqmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>The plan seems to have been initiated by a narrow selection of stakeholders with shared interests, and not in response to, or a reflection of, the Concern / Claritys and wishes of the community at large.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rklee3@gmail.com">rklee3@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2/25/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>No. It must start over, and base any development plans off existing planning Direct Feedbacks, as well as natural resource protections, including farmland and aquifiers.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rklee3@gmail.com">rklee3@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2/25/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>The county should look to attract good paying jobs in urban areas, where most live, and where existing infrastructure and brownfields could benefit from greater investment.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rklee3@gmail.com">rklee3@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2/25/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>All of it—much of this was developed without public input or in accord with existing county planning Direct Feedbacks.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rweidman@hotmail.com">rweidman@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>Can we imagine industrial development on a more modest and sustainable scale, e.g. a robust system of smaller industrial businesses that reutilize existing vacant and abandoned sites within the City and County, rather than creating future brownfields?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rweidman@hotmail.com">rweidman@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>There is little evidence in the plan that the goal of “minimizing impacts” received the same study and consideration as “benefit to industry”. The 2002 County Land Use plan limited industrial growth in the proposed area to 2,000 acres. The current proposal extends the area for development far beyond those limits. I do not believe that the proposal reflects careful study and honest recognition of lasting environmental and agricultural impacts.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rweidman@hotmail.com">rweidman@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would urge a full and thoughtful updating of the County Land Use plan—with care given to farmland preservation, green infrastructure, and development that complements, rather than threatens “the region’s unique agricultural character and natural environment.”</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:sergeantj@ymail.com">sergeantj@ymail.com</a></td>
<td>4/18/2020</td>
<td>Why do we need to destroy rich farmland, wetlands, and wildlife habitat to create more pollution? Leave the farms alone. They have worked well for years. Who is to say business will come just because you clear out the farms? Leave well enough alone!</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:sergeantj@ymail.com">sergeantj@ymail.com</a></td>
<td>4/18/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Why does the ditch need to be altered? Why not, if this is going to happen, work around nature. The area that you’re wanting to ruin was there first. Leave it alone or work around it. Why not put it on a referendum?, instead of unilaterally trying to create something that most of us oppose. Put IEC up for a vote and let the people decide what should be done.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:sergeantj@ymail.com">sergeantj@ymail.com</a></td>
<td>4/18/2020</td>
<td>What do the farmers say? I see more no and stop this signs than anything else. Listen to the people and constituents of the area. Stop the IEC, now!</td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:serryscot@yahoo.com">serryscot@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>Your plan has conflicting or confusing information Concern / Clarity of volume of water usage and the area of the industry. Is 7,200 or 22,00 acres? How can we trust a plan that has flaws or misrepresents the usage of water? If we use water to the max limit, will our community and agriculture suffer due to less water reserves and lower water table? For example we will be forced to dig our wells to match your depth. Additional toll road exit is useless. Currently Highway 2 carries 70% of the toll road volume. This is due to the expensive tolls that truckers will avoid if possible. There is no reason to uselessly destroy more local property with an additional toll road exit. It wouldn’t be used anyway.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:serryscot@yahoo.com">serryscot@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>This industrial plan reads like an epitaph to agriculture. It is full of nice words for agriculture, but moves right on to describe a future without agriculture. Manipulations,....that is what this plan is. How can ANY development plan or DRAFT start before A NEW AREA LAND USE PLAN HAS BEEN DEVELOPED?...cart before the horse! The county officials should have stopped this way before 6 million dollars were spent, but they still have the power to stop further industrial growth here.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:serryscot@yahoo.com">serryscot@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>The public input to July 2018 meeting was one sided. The public was NOT encouraged to give input. We were merely told. How is industry more beneficial than agriculture? People must to eat! A few new jobs don't out weigh the damage to the environment and the community. How can ANY development plan or DRAFT start before A NEW AREA LAND USE PLAN HAS BEEN DEVELOPED?...cart before the horse! The county officials should have stopped this way before 6 million dollars were spent, but they still have the power to stop further industrial growth here.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:serrytheresa@yahoo.com">serrytheresa@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/22/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>This IEC plan has ambiguous information. It is not clear if the 42 million gallons of water proposed as “safe levels of usage” are for the small (7,200 acres) or large (22,000 acres) IEC plan. Is this an intentional error to pacify the public?...or is this the care and precision we are to expect from those making life altering studies / plans? Does our county have the resources to enforce responsible use of our environment?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:serrytheresa@yahoo.com">serrytheresa@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/22/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>“Regardless, the premise of the size of the plan itself should be the main and basic question here – do we, as a County, really want to facilitate the creation of the 9th largest industrial mega-plex in the country? Or do we think that we should reconsider an economic vision whose roots are 40 years old, as being the correct vision for the future—when we know how much has changed in the world’s economy over the last 40 years.”</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:serrytheresa@yahoo.com">serrytheresa@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/22/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>We are largely an agricultural area. If we should build on our strengths, build on agriculture. The IEC plan will DISPLACE families and functioning farms that have pre-existing industry in this area. This entire proposed plan minimizes what makes this area strong, THAT is community. Three and four generations of many families including my own have lived in this local area. We are not waiting for “salvation” in the form of a factory job. We would rather fight for our American right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. People live in this area because we CHOOSE to. We are here because it suits us AS IS.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:serrytheresa@yahoo.com">serrytheresa@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/22/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>“There is a huge assumption that economic growth and prosperity will magically follow if we simply allow in mega-site industrial development. This doesn’t align with current trends of automation, global capital, and rapid movement of businesses to save money. This may bring us very few benefits and cause permanent damage to an established agricultural ecosystem.”</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:serrytheresa@yahoo.com">serrytheresa@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/22/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>According to the study of our aquifer, it is fragile. The soils of the proposed IEC area are NOT LINED WITH CLAY that would protect the underlying aquifer from direct contamination from pollutants. Also, the shallowness of the soil layer (only 4-6 feet in places) DOES NOT protect our aquifer.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:serrytheresa@yahoo.com">serrytheresa@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/22/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>This chapter praises the glory of industry, but says nothing of HOW the current glory of our area will be preserved. How will water, air, land, people, and agriculture be preserved? ... What assurances do we have besides supportive words that this aggressive development will not continue unchecked? No promises made in this Direct Feedback.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:serrytheresa@yahoo.com">serrytheresa@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/22/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Current industries already lie at the doorstep of New Carlisle and within Olive Township, and impact the lives of residents in the area. We were able to speak to many of these residents, and heard of the noise, air pollution, and debris that literally flies through the air from current industry. Everyone wants the best of New Carlisle and Olive Township to remain, and using these small-town assets as a simple sales tool without ensuring the quality of life preservation is wrong.” ~Kathy Schuth …said it well.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:serrytheresa@yahoo.com">serrytheresa@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Also the County Land Use Plan from 2002 supports agriculture in this area and limits the growth of proposed industry to 2,000 acres. We are BEYOND that acreage now! Why?...because Schalliol has received permission for studies that he then uses as reason to keep his snowball rolling. Who will take control and block this wrecking ball? ...elected officials?! ...you?</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:serrytheresa@yahoo.com">serrytheresa@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/23/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>On 10-22-19 Bill Schalliol presented the IEC plan to our county council. The public presentation of the Indiana Enterprise Center was the first in 16 months and it was not intended for public input. I was there. The presentation was over an hour long with more than 50 slides and NONE Direct Feedbacked public input, only studies and committee meetings. Schalliol ADMITTED that this project was built from the top down, NOT from the grass-roots up. Check the meeting notes. Nothing much has changed in his proposal today. He just avoided offensive terminology that residents have pointed out.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:serrytheresa@yahoo.com">serrytheresa@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4/22/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>Finally, Schalliol has a serious conflict of interest. His commission has NOT RELEASED FUNDING to start the next County Land Use Plan when the current one expires this year. It is in Schalliol’s interest with the IEC to push on hard and fast BEFORE a new County Land Use Plan allows the public input to check its unbridled growth. County Council, please take control of the IEC project! Do your job and manage for the sake of your constituents.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:slingar@sbcglobal.net">slingar@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>The IEC plan overstates the involvement of the public in the planning process. Appendices that are referenced are not provided with the &quot;Plan&quot;.</td>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:slingar@sbcglobal.net">slingar@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>The IEC plan puts development goals in the wrong place. The brown fields on the west side of South Bend could be reclaimed for industry and commerce where employment opportunities are needed, NOT Olive Township. LEAVE FARMS AND OUR RURAL COMMUNITIES ALONE!!</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:slingar@sbcglobal.net">slingar@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>All in all, use EXISTING opportunities from scarred land and existing infrastructure: Ignition Park, Renaissance District, LEAVE FARMS AND OUR RURAL COMMUNITIES ALONE!! Black Thorn Industrial Park, brown field areas within the west side of South Ben.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:slingar@sbcglobal.net">slingar@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>4/21/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>The IEC plan has been adjusted from 22000 acres to 7200 acres; current 2002 Comprehensive County land use plan industrial development to 2000 acres in New Carlisle which exist ALREADY... &quot;at 7200 acres the IEC is the ninth largest industrial mega site in the US&quot; The county should be putting industrial development where it will definitely benefit <a href="mailto:thslingar@sbcglobal.nete">thslingar@sbcglobal.nete</a> community/jobs on reclaimed brown fields in South Bend. LEAVE FARMS AND RURAL COMMUNITIES ALONE11</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Lingar 58640 Peach Rd South Bend IN 46619</td>
<td>4/24/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>The current approved 2002 Comprehensive County land use plan identifies industrial development limited to 2000 acres in New Carlisle which already exist. The IEC plan has been adjusted from 22000 acres to 7200 acres. &quot;at 7200 acres the IEC is the ninth largest industrial mega site in the US&quot;. The county should be putting industrial development where it will definitely benefit the community/jobs on reclaimed brown fields in South Bend.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Lingar 58640 Peach Rd</td>
<td>4/24/2020</td>
<td>2) The IEC Plan put developmental goals in the wrong place.</td>
<td>The brown fields on the west side of South Bend could be reclaimed for industry and commerce where employment opportunities are needed, not Olive township.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bend IN 46620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Lingar 58640 Peach Rd</td>
<td>4/24/2020</td>
<td>3) The IEC plan threatens farmland and the small town/rural community</td>
<td>The IEC plan does not address increased truck and train traffic and its impact on the rural area. Of major Concern / Clarity is the affect all of this will have on the aquifer and what relocating ditches will mean.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bend IN 46621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Lingar 58640 Peach Rd</td>
<td>4/24/2020</td>
<td>The IEC plan overstates the involvement of the public in the planning</td>
<td>The IEC plan overstates the involvement of the public in the planning process. Appendices that are referenced are not provided with the &quot;Plan&quot;.</td>
<td>Appendicies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bend IN 46622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:tamisyn@gmail.com">tamisyn@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>Making sure that this feedback process is well advertised beyond the NC corporate boundaries seeing as air quality, water quality, noise pollution and lack of farmland impacts a much wider area. Also, don’t purchase land while at the same time publicly stating that the plan had not been finalized and that public comments will still be taken.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:tamisyn@gmail.com">tamisyn@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>Why is current farmland being taken for this project when also in St Joseph County are the idle and dilapidated Singer and Bendix properties which are already zoned for industrial use.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:tamisyn@gmail.com">tamisyn@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>The vision statement does articulate the desired outcome. However, as one of those outcomes is to work with the City of New Carlisle and according to the South Bend Tribune of 2/19/20 the NC Council voted that this project should align with a previously voted upon maximum area for industrial development, that established ordinance should be followed.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:tamisyn@gmail.com">tamisyn@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3/11/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>Has there been a disclosure of what if any personal financial impact this development will have for Mr Schalliol or Mr Kostielney? (this may sound unfair, but follow the money is a reasonable action in all politics)</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thesavorymuse@gmail.com">thesavorymuse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>I also have Concern / Clarities about shipping the waste all the way to South Bend’s wastewater treatment plant.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thesavorymuse@gmail.com">thesavorymuse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>This area could have been directed toward showcasing the natural landscape and its historical richness, providing natural areas of beauty and renewal, creatively and intelligently finding ways to create a natural attraction for renewal and contemplation and outdoor activity. Natural areas are scarce in Indiana, and with this region being the gateway through the midwest (via the Toll Road, proximity to Chicago, etc.) the amazing historical aspects of the area could potentially have become a destination for travelers and visitors.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thesavorymuse@gmail.com">thesavorymuse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Finally, talking about bikeways is great, but will the view of a megaplex industrial complex make for scenic rides?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thesavorymuse@gmail.com">thesavorymuse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have the various layers of data - groundwater, aquifers, soils, etc. - considered the interconnectivity of habitats that exist there and that could be improved, rather than used as sacrifice zones?</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thesavorymuse@gmail.com">thesavorymuse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>This question appears to only apply to the monetary aspects of the industries in question. The degradation of the watershed, landscape, and agricultural community are not advantages to the residents in this region.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thesavorymuse@gmail.com">thesavorymuse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>The IEC degrades many existing assets here - rich agricultural landscape, high quality aquifer water for local residents and farming, a unique watershed that will forever be destroyed. So yes - you are missing a great number of assets in this region and community that will be forever negatively impacted due to the IEC.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thesavorymuse@gmail.com">thesavorymuse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>This landscape is special, and historical, and includes a rich watershed that will be forever degraded. Farmers are being uprooted and not supported, aquifers are being co-opted by polluting industries, and the Kankakee River watershed - which has a unique and rich history of being the largest wetland drainage in the country - is being further destroyed. Environmentally, if the planning had been thoughtfully done, it would have considered the environmental consequences of the IEC degrading the landscape.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thesavorymuse@gmail.com">thesavorymuse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Growth and development for me includes a strong understanding and consideration of the importance of a healthy and diverse environment - meaning, the ecology, watershed health, strong reliance on wetland and ecosystem services, and sustaining the integrity of the natural landscape.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thesavorymuse@gmail.com">thesavorymuse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Concept Area C, which includes wetlands and the Niespodziany Ditch, do not give any sense of protection efforts for those habitats.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thesavorymuse@gmail.com">thesavorymuse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>The references to the Niespodziany Ditch being in the way do not give me the impression that it is a valued part of the landscape that will be truly protected. Same with Concept Area D, which does not say what specific industries are targeted for that area, which is in close proximity to the popular and valuable Bendix Woods - which is not even mentioned in the text.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thesavorymuse@gmail.com">thesavorymuse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Considering stormwater, there better be substantial Green Infrastructure to handle the decreased permeable surfaces to handle our climate change realities.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thesavorymuse@gmail.com">thesavorymuse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>I believe that this project should have been sited on an already contaminated or compromised site, such as a brownfield site, rather than taking an uncontaminated site for heavy industry such as this. Why sacrifice an area that has more potential to be a 'clean' site, rather than utilizing brownfield areas that are already compromised? There is value and potential in this area, but the IEC will undoubtedly prevent that from becoming a possibility in the future. It is much easier to restore a less compromised site, than to spend more dollars on cleaning up a compromised site later.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thesavorymuse@gmail.com">thesavorymuse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>I don’t believe they capture my desired outcomes, nor those desired outcomes of the many people in St Joseph County who have not been fully informed of the true purposes of this project. And, the desired outcomes that were included in the 2002 County Land Use Plan are not the same as those in this IEC plan, especially those that consider environmental quality and the importance of agricultural land in this region.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thesavorymuse@gmail.com">thesavorymuse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>Mechanisms should include comprehensive and accessible public input, and CONSIDERATION of the 2002 County Land Use plan in this entire process of consideration, development, input, and implementation. Particularly the environmental aspects.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thesavorymuse@gmail.com">thesavorymuse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>I do not believe the feedback was honestly nor fairly sought from the public. The confusion stems from inappropriate methods and lack of public notification. Dividing people at an information gathering session prevents the participants from being given the same information, and prevents them from providing their comments on the entire range of information.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thesavorymuse@gmail.com">thesavorymuse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/27/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>All areas need to be invited for public input in a more comprehensive and fair way. This was not a democratic process for comments and input.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thompson20@netzero.net">thompson20@netzero.net</a></td>
<td>3/25/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>We are in complete opposition to the IEC - specifically - Bill Schalliol's leadership as he carelessly uses taxpayer money to try to coerce and manipulate the development of prime, irreplaceable, precious farm ground for a radical infrastructure development with no guarantees whatsoever of future development or jobs for St. Joe County residents. There has already been farm land for sale for a long time in this area that isn't selling, and there is actually current industry shutting down.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thompson20@netzero.net">thompson20@netzero.net</a></td>
<td>3/25/2020</td>
<td>Our hardworking middle son and his wife, Carter and Katie Thompson, have since been in the process of building a beautiful and very expensive home directly south of our home/barn. They are on pace to move into it soon. Shortly after they started the surveying/deed transfer and septic process (early last year) we had a neighbor alert us to the IEC area map. (we had absolutely no prior knowledge of it.) We were shocked to see that on the map there was a proposed road cutting right across the southeast corner of our property (intersection of Wintergreen Rd. and Early Rd.) It is a proposed road to apparently connect Early and Edison Roads for future Industrial traffic.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>290 of 305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:thompson20@netzero.net">thompson20@netzero.net</a></td>
<td>3/25/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>In the earlier IEC map proposal (the one that we were initially alerted to a year ago) - there was also a big loop road (roundabout) involved in the connecting road between Early and Edison Roads also involving Wintergreen Road. I was so Concern / Clarityed when I saw it and alerted our neighbor across the street whose land would be radically disrupted. Ralph and Martha Smith owned the 40- acre farm across from us on the East side of Wintergreen Road for over a half century. They were treasured hard-working people in this community. They both passed away in recent years and their son now owns their former home and 20 of those acres. It was shocking to see that the roundabout was going to be placed right where Ralph and Martha’s garden had always been and where their ashes have been lovingly placed. I’m also sad to say that my niece, Corrie Carr, (a South Bend Fire Fighter) recently purchased the other 20 acres of the former Smith farm. She also now has the threat of the IEC and that connecting road looming over all of her future plans to build on the property that she paid very hard earned money for. The proposed road runs right through the middle of her 20 acre parcel.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>A great deal is mentioned in this chapter of the low taxes that Indiana offers to businesses. It would be helpful to have a quantitative idea of the tax revenues brought in by existing IEC businesses to St. Joseph County. Will the anticipated taxes more than cover the cost of additional required infrastructure improvements: roads, sewage treatment, water, etc.?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>Not enough has been done to prepare for the negative impacts of the development. The county must keep residents informed in advance, maintain transparency, and ask for input prior to spending large amounts of TIF money.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 5?</td>
<td>Are the increased taxes generated available to fund better schools and roads, or just to spend more on development? Finally, before developing any more in the IEC area, we should be using existing space already set aside for development in South Bend and the area next to the South Bend airport. South Bend is a part of Saint Joseph County, let’s not forget.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>3. A great deal is mentioned in this chapter of the low taxes that Indiana offers to businesses. It would be helpful to have a quantitative idea of the tax revenues brought in by existing IEC businesses to St. Joseph County. Will the anticipated taxes more than cover the cost of additional required infrastructure improvements: roads, sewage treatment, water, environmental clean-up, health costs associated with deteriorating air and water quality, etc. Sure, you can attract businesses to the area with low tax rates, and tax rebates for years and years. Can you assure us that the benefits will outweigh the costs? “Best state for regulatory environment” that is listed in the rankings suggests to me that Indiana does a poor job of forcing compliance with environmental regulations on air and water quality.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>It appears from Figure 3.5 that flood plains severely limit development to the 7,200-acre core development area. And yet the 22,000-acre planning area suggests the desire for eventual development beyond the 7,200 acres of the CDA.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>Traffic and roads are included in the chapter 3, but the inherent problems of traffic are passed over rather quickly. Traffic on SR 2 is admittedly heavy at present, nearly as heavy as traffic on the toll road. Introducing warehouses and distribution centers into the IEC will only add to the traffic. Will a by-pass be planned to route traffic around New Carlisle? If so, the by-pass will divert truck traffic from the town, but also potential tourist and retail traffic to the small shops and outlets of New Carlisle. The increased traffic can only add to the deterioration of air quality.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>It appears that some thought has been given to water availability with the assumption that this is so plentiful, it is not a problem. But there is no estimate of what the needs might be if the development reaches capacity. Also, the estimate of 49 MGD appear to be for the whole 22,000-acre planning area, and not for the smaller CDA. Also, what will be impact of large consumption and pumping of water by industry on the water table. Will existing homeowners need to drill deeper wells? Who will pay for that?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>- Water that is used by industry needs to be disposed of through the sewer system. It is not clear whether the existing capacity is adequate.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>- Under Agribusiness the Direct Feedback includes implementing farmland preservation policies and programs. No details are provided. How will farmers be able to survive and thrive as the IEC will inevitably drive up property values and property taxes? Great for a farmer who wants to sell, but not for a farmer who wants to farm.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>-What is the cost of these infrastructure improvements that are going to attract new businesses? Roads, utilities, freight rail improvements? How will these be paid for? All out of TIF money? The details of these plans can make a huge difference to residents of the area. There is some mention under the heading “Coordination and Collaboration” regarding community stakeholders having a voice. But the record so far is not at all encouraging that this will happen openly and transparently or will be open to more than a select few. This must change.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/3030</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>In general, the process was set up backwards. For two or three years the redevelopment commission thought its best path forward was to plan, spend TIF money, purchase land, and then at the end ask the public for its approval. The public and taxpayers need to be consulted at the outset of the project, not after. Spending millions of dollars first, then asking the public for input is asking for a predetermined conclusion.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Success needs to be measured in other terms than merely economic growth or tax revenue. It needs to be measured in terms of how it creates better paying jobs for people in the county, not by creating jobs primarily for outsiders. Does it make the county a more desirable place to live? Does it help to reduce the wealth gap?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>It is nice to see that bike paths and park set asides are being considered. Great, but I wonder if I would really want to bike on these paths if I live in South Bend or New Carlisle, if I would need to load a bike up on a car first, then park, and unload to then bike next to a bunch of factories. Think about the reality of that.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/3030</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>The Vision Statement and Guiding Principles as presented in the draft are all fine and laudable; for example, who can argue with the goal of a strong economy, thriving environment, etc. However, I think that some important goals have been left out. A strong economy for whom? Large corporations that provide a few jobs, but where the profits return to owners outside St. Joseph County and Indiana? The draft implies that the current agricultural economy is undeveloped and needs to be replaced with more productive ventures. Also, lacking in the goals is how the IEC relates to development inside South Bend proper. It does not even address development in South Bend; and it seems to ignore all the failed or incomplete or vacant industrial development properties already existing in the city or just outside of the city. Finally, an important goal related to resilience is how the IEC deals with the threat of global warming and climate change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>The asset of high-quality soil is neglected. Soon we will need this agricultural land to supply food locally and to the nation as climate change and variable rainfall reduces productivity globally. Also, the Direct Feedback fails to address how existing agriculture in the IEC will be protected from new development. How will you ensure that New Carlisle will be able to retain its quality of life?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>- Regarding soil, since it is not possible to build directly on the soil and since bedrock is 150 ft below the surface, this means that topsoil will of necessity need to be removed before building. The Concern / Clarity here is that the land will forever be removed from agricultural use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>-Another goal is to minimize sprawl. The obvious way to reduce sprawl is to focus development in South Bend and the area just outside of South Bend using existing brown fields. Many or most of the goals of the IEC could just as easily be transferred to the South Bend vacant areas already waiting for development. And then there would be no need for the IEC. No discussion of this option is even considered. Many of the advantages of the IEC already apply to the South Bend commercial development sites: transportation, water, services, tax benefits, etc.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2030</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>It is not clear to me how the larger planning areas relate to the core development area. There seems to be the idea that the larger planning areas are simply phase II or phase III developments. That when the core development is completed or filled in, then the larger planning areas will be developed as well. If that is the case, residents have reason to be fearful of the community becoming ever more congested and undesirable as a place to live and work. No where in the draft Direct Feedback does it explain how or if the development size is limited. Yes there is a core development area of 2,200 acres, but no guidance is given for whether this can be exceeded and if so, on what basis. Who decides?</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>There needs to be more public input into a land use plan. There needs to be more input into how the IEC will address the impacts of the plan on residents, for example, traffic, water usage and pollution, etc.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vicmyers@mindspring.com">vicmyers@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>4/25/3030</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>You say that feedback was gathered during the planning process. That is accepted as a given, but it was obvious that this feedback was limited to a narrow range of individuals and business interests. The general public, including me, was not invited into the discussions that I was aware of. We came to sessions of the redevelopment commission or the county council meetings where the IEC was on the agenda. But it was a one-sided debate. The public could share their comments or objections, but there was never any dialogue or genuine exchange of ideas, back and forth. Public hearings with Q&amp;A were absent. These were promised on occasion, but then did not take place. Were farmers as a whole ever invited into the discussions? I am not aware of that being the case.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:w.miller@olive-township.com">w.miller@olive-township.com</a></td>
<td>3/2/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>One other form of pollution to consider is light pollution. Folks in New Carlisle and Olive Township like the stars. It's one of the reasons I moved here.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:w.miller@olive-township.com">w.miller@olive-township.com</a></td>
<td>3/2/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>They are clear, but I feel that it would be best to explain what each of the areas are exactly if they are not explained later in the Management Plan.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:w.miller@olive-township.com">w.miller@olive-township.com</a></td>
<td>3/2/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>1) The towns water treatment facility will need to be improved or replaced in the near future. Are there any plans for that?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:w.miller@olive-township.com">w.miller@olive-township.com</a></td>
<td>3/2/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>2) The town currently contracts with other electrical providers for our electric. Are there any plans to receive power directly from the plant in New Carlisle?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:w.miller@olive-township.com">w.miller@olive-township.com</a></td>
<td>3/2/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>3) Could having a sewer treatment plant for the town of New Carlisle create cost savings for the residents instead of pumping our sewage to South Bend?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:w.miller@olive-township.com">w.miller@olive-township.com</a></td>
<td>3/2/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>4) How can we ensure that the taxes from the IEC will stay in our area and not go to other areas such as Mishawaka, Granger and South Bend?</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:w.miller@olive-township.com">w.miller@olive-township.com</a></td>
<td>3/2/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>Yes. I believe the New Carlisle area as well as the west side of South Bend would benefit from a medical facility that would have emergency and short term care services. A higher education facilities should be considered. Proposed residential sites (i.e. subdivisions, condo's, etc.) may also be helpful in the total vision.</td>
<td>Direct Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:w.miller@olive-township.com">w.miller@olive-township.com</a></td>
<td>3/2/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>I believe Brownsburg had a workshop that allowed residents to sit down with a representative to ask questions and give feedback. From what I understand, a presentation was given, but no real means of giving feedback. Our residents have specific questions that elected officials in the township and town do not have answers for due to lack of communication and outreach.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wurthwhile@gmail.com">wurthwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Are the area boundaries (Study Area, Planning Area, Core Development Area, and New Carlisle Economic Development Area) clear and concise? How would you approach discussion regarding these areas to further inform others not familiar with the project?</td>
<td>The boundaries are clear and concise. However, what is not clear is the extent of the development desired outside of the core area in the planning area and perhaps further into the overall study area.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wurthwhile@gmail.com">wurthwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 1?</td>
<td>I find that this introduction contains much flowery language about the purported benefits of the IEC, but nothing besides a cursory list of the potential negative effects in the Opportunities / Concern / Claritys chart. Additionally, the 'character of the community' is often referenced as one of the strengths of the project. However, one would have to be a fool to believe that the 'character' of the area would be irreparably changed and diminished by a 7200 to 22000 acre industrial development.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wurthwhile@gmail.com">wurthwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there additional reasons that would further constrain developmental impacts within the Core Development Area? See Figure 3.5</td>
<td>As noted in the study, the existing rail traffic, particularly for the NS line is already at +/- 100 trains per day. As a resident of this area who lives near the NS corridor, I am very Concern / Clarityed about the capacity of this corridor to accommodate additional traffic. Simple math tells us that 100 trains per day equates to one train every 15 minutes or less - all day every day. Will the proponents of the IEC also advocate for separated grade crossings and no-whistle zones to alleviate this already 'particularly heavy activity' as identified in the study? Additionally, with many of these trains already carrying dozens of tankers of dangerous and flammable chemicals, has the increased chance of a catastrophic rail accident been factored into the plans?</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wurthwhile@gmail.com">wurthwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other existing conditions that have not been studied for which we should be aware?</td>
<td>Perhaps not an existing condition, but a condition that will likely exist in the future would be the discussion of the floodplain. The study states that 'portions...are within the 1% annual chance...of a 100 year flood'. However, as we are seeing more and more around the country, reliance on 100 year flood maps is becoming increasingly more unreliable. Due to the effects of climate change, these extreme events are occurring more and more frequently and with greater impact. So perhaps an acknowledgment of this trend and a study of what the floodplain will look like in 20 years after much of this proposed development may occur would tell a different story than floodplain maps based on last century's obsolete data.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category / Clarity</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wurthwhile@gmail.com">wurthwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 3?</td>
<td>Once again, the study ironically mentions the area as a 'desirable place to live' due to the 'open space and natural areas'. When between 7200 and 22000 acres of what is now largely considered open space are developed, that open space responsible for the aforementioned desirability ceases to exist. And along with it the area's desirability.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wurthwhile@gmail.com">wurthwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Do you have other ideas that you would like to see implemented to improve the balance of development and growth with the need to maintain the region’s characteristics?</td>
<td>Since the study purports to characterize the IEC as such a wonderful project that will attract businesses from far and wide, perhaps some consideration should be given to a moratorium on tax abatements to draw companies to this area. As a landowner in the New Prairie school district, it boggles my mind how the school corporation had to ask for a $42M tax referendum in 2016 because it couldn't afford to maintain it's facilities. So this $42M increase was approved and became an additional disproportionate burden on the non-business taxpayers because InTek, St. Joe Energy Center, and all of the other businesses already present in the IEC (with a combined valuation approaching $4 BILLION) have tax abatements.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wurthwhile@gmail.com">wurthwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>4. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 4?</td>
<td>Yet again, there are multiple ironic references made to the charm of the community which will cease to exist when a 7200 to 22000 acre industrial development increases air, water, noise, and light pollution in this charming area.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wurthwhile@gmail.com">wurthwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Are there other competitive advantages that did not make it into the Area Management Plan? Other industries or businesses to highlight?</td>
<td>Perhaps an acknowledgment of the lax environmental regulations typically applied to industrial endeavors in Indiana could be mentioned. Also a discussion of the various elected county officials who do not live within the study area but are championing this project could be highlighted as an competitive advantage</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wurthwhile@gmail.com">wurthwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Are there other community or regional assets to highlight in the area? See Figure 2.14.</td>
<td>One might make the argument that the unmatched quality of this area's aquifer would be worth highlighting before it becomes irreversibly contaminated by all of the proposed development.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wurthwhile@gmail.com">wurthwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>3. Any other questions/comments about Chapter 2?</td>
<td>Once again, the ironic description of the 'highly desirable' town of New Carlisle with its 'small town charm and surrounding farmland' is disingenuous. With a front row seat to between 7200 and 22000 acres of industrial development, New Carlisle will cease to be desirable or charming. And it will certainly have much less of the surrounding farmland that is cited as an asset. I'm not sure how increased air, water, noise, and light pollution increases the charm of any place, let alone the dramatic increase in truck and rail traffic that is sure to accompany this development.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wurthwhile@gmail.com">wurthwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>2. Has St. Joseph County taken the necessary precautions and due diligence to prepare the region for future growth and development? What mechanisms can St. Joseph County implement that will reduce public Concern / Clarity about development within the IEC?</td>
<td>No. This development risks destroying the very charm and fabric of the community which it touts as one of the main draws of this area. The county should perform a comprehensive survey or perform a non-binding referendum during the next election to fully understand the public's appetite for this development. Currently, the only real understanding of the desire for this is the pronouncements and actions of the various county boards and commissions responsible for promoting this project.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wurthwhile@gmail.com">wurthwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Do the 3 pillars of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, and Smart Logistics frame the area appropriately, given current and potential uses? Are there other business uses that should be considered for the area?</td>
<td>These three pillars only frame the area appropriately when in the context of a desire to further develop this area. Past development such as the St. Joseph Energy Center do not fit any of these categories. Perhaps instead of asking what other businesses should be considered, the question should be what businesses should not be considered. One of the greatest fears of local residents is the promises of the IEC's three pillars leading to other businesses that fall well outside of those three categories. Would a power plant that incinerates trash be considered to fall within these three pillars? There already exists an open air car shredding operation that arguably does not fit within the definitions of Agribusiness, Advanced Manufacturing, or Smart Logistics.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wurthwhile@gmail.com">wurthwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Does the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles capture the desired outcomes for the local and regional community? Are there other principles that need to be further considered?</td>
<td>No, the guiding principles capture the desired outcomes for the small but powerful contingent of elected officials who desire to create this unnecessary development.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wurthwhile@gmail.com">wurthwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>3. As part of the planning process, feedback was gathered through various public meetings and workshops, yet there seems to be some confusion as to this process. Are there outreach strategies that may be more effective for collecting information? We welcome ideas about venues for workshops and discussions.</td>
<td>The confusion about the process exists because most of the people who would like to participate in the feedback process are not politicians and are not familiar with the workings of the various committees and processes being utilized to advance this project. A distinct effort should be made to inform the general public of various timelines and processes that have occurred and will occur and how they can materially be a part of that.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wurthwhile@gmail.com">wurthwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>1. Given the draft Direct Feedback, are there areas within it that require more public input? Which areas and why?</td>
<td>Yes, the Direct Feedback needs to include analyses of no or reduced development scenarios. This entire process needs additional public input from each and every person who lives within the study area.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wurthwhile@gmail.com">wurthwhile@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4/10/2020</td>
<td>3. How do you see growth and development? What types of jobs should the County be attracting to the area?</td>
<td>Growth and development should be far sighted and inclusive - if it is desired at all. There is an inherent assumption in this study that growth and development is a good thing. While change is inevitable and the residents of this area would be foolish to think that everything should or will stay the same as it always has been, growth and development in the character of the second half of the last century (which fully describes the IEC) is unsustainable, unhealthy, and unwise. St. Joseph County should be pivoting to industry based in the tech sector - much as the development of the former Studebaker corridor has done. Increasing manufacturing and all of the undesirable side effects that come with it - pollution of all kinds, sprawl, habitat loss, increased traffic, decreased quality of life, and corporate welfare through endless tax abatements - is short sighted and not the right fit for St. Joseph County.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:zawodny@sbcglobal.net">zawodny@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>3/5/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>The black N-S 'smudge' that appears east of the buildings and west of the tilled land is our runway. So, definitely an impact to our current arrangement. To be clear, the area we use during flying is greater than just the runway area; we have overfly access over the entire property (and then some) to the north, south, and east of the runway. While we have 'access' to the area north, south, and west of the runway (but east of Snowberry), we rarely use it because we would be overflying Snowberry and the Kaplon’s buildings --- which would not be safe. Which brings me to the area needed to SAFELY operate radio controlled model aircraft --- some of which can exceed 8' wingspan, 20 pounds in weight, and may be powered by turbine (i.e., jet) engine(s). It is not unusual for an individual’s flying session to overfly all the area east of the Kaplon’s buildings --- some 30+ acres. Therefore, proximity to additional buildings and roads would create an unsafe environment for model flight operations. As a sanctioned club within the Academy of Model Aeronautics (a national organization with a 70+ year history of education and safety) we take safety to ourselves and the local population and area VERY SERIOUSLY. With or without the road corridor plans, our flying site would be close enough to future development to most likely require our club activities to relocate. The big question is: timing. Yes, your comments such as: &quot;likely way off in the future&quot; and</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:amea1998@hotmail.com">amea1998@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>6/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>When I look up this development proposal, I see articles titled &quot;controversial&quot; which I'm pleased with. Industrial development better be controversial, because from my point of view, this is a terrible deal for this community long-term. Sure, it advertises the creation of thousands of jobs at the start, but won't those jobs be mechanized quicker and before the community (**our community) will actually reap the benefits of that employment. This may be a &quot;good deal&quot; per your pretty proposals that I've read through and I'm sure cost a pretty penny to curate. The businesses we hope will move into the industrial park may have to have &quot;environmentally clean processes&quot; according to Chapter 4, p. 75. But let me tell you this, I am not sold that permanently changing ecologically significant farmland into an &quot;industrial playground&quot; (as one article put it) is what is best for our community long-term.</td>
<td>Concern / Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Email: anna.adamsson@msn.com
Date: 6/17/2020
Question:
2. Part of the plan includes land conservation and green infrastructure requirements. Are there other types of sustainable development we should be considering?

Comment:
1) There are a lot of maybes and mights in this proposal especially when talking about green infrastructure, renewable energy and the like. Are the public transit shuttles, bike paths, and other green infrastructure just "pie in the sky ideas" that were rolled out in this proposal to make us feel better? If not, then please stop using the "might" or "maybe" in the proposal and show us proof that if the area is developed these things WILL DEFINITELY happen.
2) What processes do you plan on having in place to actually make sure that stormwater management protocols (and other biologically and environmentally significant areas and protocols) that are laid out in the proposal will actually be obeyed by the new residents of the industrial park long-term? How do we as a community and a county know if they are not being environmentally safe or otherwise harming our environment, and what kinds of mechanisms and consequences is the county prepared to take if the industries do take advantage of the environment.
3) Finally, the proposal states a few times that the IEC will run off of "clean, efficient energy sources", but then later I read that the natural gas utilities will be able to serve any prospective user immediately. NATURAL GAS IS NOT CLEAN ENERGY. I don't know what planet the writer of this proposal lives on, but RENEWABLE sources of energy (wind, solar, hydropower, thermopower, etc.) are the only way forward to actually be sustainable. If this industrial park gets developed, then they must expand the solar farm (p. 80) and run 100% off solar. Additionally, I think business growth can only be accompanied by direct investment into our low-income and...