INDOT 2030 Plan Update Early Coordination Meeting Notes

Fort Wayne District Meeting at Fort Wayne, June 23, 2004 9:00 AM - 11:00 PM

In Attendance: *John Leckie, Fort Wayne District Development Engineer*
Steve Smith, INDOT Central Office, Planning Manager
Roy Nunnally, INDOT, Central Office, Planning

Steve Smith kicked the meeting off discussing the meeting's purpose and expected outcome. Discussions relative to equity issues in the currently long range plan and relinquishment issues. Steve explained the two committee's responsible for the development/oversight of the INDOT 2030 Plan: A Policy Oversight Committee and a Technical Committee. Steve discussed each committee's role and notes that issues of equity and a relinquishment policy are topics to be discussed by the Policy Oversight Committee.

John Leckie provided a list of major expansion projects extracted from the INDOT 25-year plan that were evaluated and provided comments relative to changes in the project priority, proposed projects, and recommended changes in project scope.

PROJECT EVALUATION DISCUSSIONS

1. US 33 Added Travel Lane Projects. INDOT currently have a series of added travel lanes project on US 33 (LRP ID # 727 & 349) from O'Day Rd. to US 30. The District does not have a problem with these projects, however, they feel that since US 33 is a mobility corridor, that added travel lanes project are needed to the west of project # 727 (O'Day Road) at the least. The statewide model build (052504) network supports the District's recommendations, forecasting a LOS F.

   Comment: *The INDOT planning section will evaluate the recommended added travel lane project from SR 205to O'Day Rd. Currently listed in the INDOT 25-Year Plan is LRP ID #504, Road Reconstruction from SR 205 to O'Day Rd, with an RFC Date 2015. If added travel lanes are warranted, LRP ID # 504 will be reclassified as an added travel lanes project*

2. Angola Bypass Study – The District notes there's an eccentric need for this proposed alternative. The District recommends evaluation of an alignment south of Angola. The District also notes that if the bypass is constructed, SR 827 should be relinquished.

3. US 33 Goshen Bypass Study – The District notes that this proposed alternative is a valid need. Currently the project is on hold due to litigation issues. The District notes one possible alternative would include developing CR 17 as a major corridor, which would relieve through traffic on US 33 thru Goshen.

   Comment: *No Comments relative to the Goshen Bypass. Comments for CR 17 Corridor is listed in the next project comments.*

4. CR 17 Corridor – The District notes that controlling access on this facility could present a problem, but feels access control is an excellent concept. A southern peripihial route would be great. But developing the corridor has various issues including the fact that SR 15 runs through CR 17. But The District notes that without access control, business may decide to relocate and create additional congestion issues on the corridor.

   Comment: *The planning section supports CR 17 as a major north south corridor for the Elkhart and Koscuiosko Counties as a local federal aid type project.*

5. SR 930 Corridor – Currently INDOT has two projects listed in the INDOT 25-year plan on the SR 930 corridor: project # 341 from Parnell Ave to Crescent Ave; and project # 342 from Lincoln Ave to 0.7 Minnich Road in South Haven. The District notes that both projects should not be included in the INDOT 2030 Plan update if the project is targeted for relinquishment. However, if the facility is not targeted for relinquishment, these projects should be included in the INDOT 2030 plan. As long as this project is targeted for relinquishment, there will be minimal investments to this corridor. Only maintenance related investments.

   Comment: *INDOT desires to relinquish SR 930. PMG has requested that project # 341 not be included in the INDOT 2030 plan update. Discussions relative to developing/updating INDOT's statewide relinquishment policy are underway.*

6. SR 14 Corridor – INDOT currently have added capacity project listed in the 25-Year from West Hamilton Road to I-69. The district recommends advancing project #725, added travel lanes from West Hamilton to Scott Rd. ASAP. The District notes that the project also has political support for advancement. INDOT currently have the project listed in the INDOT 25-Year plan with a 2019 RFC Date. The District also proposes extending this project from West Hamilton to the Whitely County Line Road due to recent and anticipated commercial and residential development along the corridor includes segments in the adjacent Whitely county area. The District also notes project # 501, from Hadley Road to I-69 also needs some type of access management strategy to be implemented such as left-turn restrictions.

   Comment: *The INDOT planning section support adding travel lanes from the County Line Road to West Hamilton Road and will evaluate this project to be included in the INDOT 2030 Plan update as a "placeholder" project. The planning section also notes that the SR 14 corridor has issues similar to the US 36 Corridor in Danville, just west of Indianapolis. Due to the rapid/anticipated increases in commercial and residential activities adjacent to the corridor and in Whitely County, adding travel lanes alone will not address long term travel demand issues. The planning section will coordinate with the Fort Wayne MPO to develop supplemental alternative such as: developing local parallel routes, implementing access control strategies, and others strategies suggested by the MPO. .*

   SR 5 from US 20 to 120 – The District notes that ROW on SR 5 through Shipshewana is an issue. The district is recommending a bi-directional turn lane from US 20 to just

before SR 120. Currently, INDOT has project # 519, a TSM project identified in our 20-year plan on SR 5 from US 20 to Middlebury Street in Shipshewana with a 2017 RFC Date. The project is a HERS_IN recommended project. Both the district and the planning section agree that extending the project limits of the TSM projects to SR 120 would suffice for now.

Comment: *The INDOT planning section notes this project is ideal for context sensitive design solution*

7. I-69 from SR 1 to CR 11A - The district would like to add a lane from SR 1 to Hursh Road. The District notes that the segment is scheduled for reconstruction in 2016 and it would make sense to add an additional lane to the segment at that time. The District notes that the segment from Hursh Rd to CR 11A could be added later. The District notes anticipate congestion on these segments and recommends incorporating these projects as "placeholders" in the plan.

   Comment: *Relative to adding travel lanes from Hursh Road to CR 11A, the INDOT build network does not identify capacity issues for the segment in the 2030 time frame. The portion from SR 1 to Hursh Road, the model shows a 2030 LOS of "C". The INDOT planning section will evaluate this project to be included in the INDOT 2030 Plan Update.*

8. SR 3 from Dupont Road to Carroll Road - INDOT currently list project # 325, added travel lanes from Ludwig Road to Dupont Road, RFC Date 2005. The District recommends pushing the project out to 2007 and extending the project limits from Dupont to Carroll Road. The District notes that the area is increasing in residential development and recommends that the new extension is incorporated in the 2030 plan a "placeholder" project for the 2020-2024 time frame.

   Comment: *The INDOT statewide build network show a LOS "D" from Dupont to just south of Carroll Road. The INDOT planning section will evaluate this project to be included in the 2030 plan update.*

9. SR 37 from Doty to Cuba Road – The District proposes a road reconstruction for this segment and notes that the segment has safety issues, very limited ROW, and traverses through Amish territory. The District notes that added capacity is needed for non-motorized vehicles (Amish Buggies). The District recommends that the segment be reconstructed with 8-10 Ft. shoulder minimal for Amish buggies at the least. The District notes that the limited ROW presents makes maintaining the facility difficult.

   Comment: *Steve Smith recommends that The District speak with INDOT's congestion and safety management section relative to safety issues the corridor has. The INDOT statewide model shows a LOS "D" by 2030 from Doty to Cuba Road. The INDOT planning section will evaluate a proposed added travel lanes project for this segment in our 2030 plan update. We will have to coordinate with both the INDOT district and MPO as to what implementation period will the project be placed.*

10. Project # 668, Road Recon., US 27 from SR 218 to SR 124 - The District notes that SR 27 is a Statewide Mobility Corridor recommends that the Road Reconstruction project be advanced. INDOT currently list the project in our current plan with a 2023 RFC Date. INDOT currently has a Statewide Access Management Study underway that could be used to evaluate the corridor relative to the impacts of an access management strategy. The District notes that segments of US 27 have serious drainage issues just south of the small town of Berne which causes some flooding. The District also notes that the area is a potential wetland and terrain issue with and would be difficult to protect the roadway from flooding.

    Comment: *No Comments*

11. SR 8 from CR 35 to SR 101 – The District proposes a Road Reconstruction project for this segment and notes that the facility has some geometric deficiencies. The District notes that the Fort Wayne MPO supports this proposed project. The project is not a capacity issue. The District notes that the proposed project would tie into INDOT LRP project #524, TSM from Depot Street to CR 40A, RFC Date 2008.

    Comment: *INDOT will evaluate this project for inclusion in the 2030 plan update.*

12. SR 8 from SR 3 to SR 327 – The District proposes an Added Travel Lanes project on this segment. The District notes that the segment is a major industrial corridor and believes SR 8 will become an issue in the future and will require attention due to increased industrial traffic volumes. The District notes that this project would connect INDOT LRP project # 522, Added Travel Lanes from SR 327 to US 27, RFC Date 2012.

    Comment: *INDOT will evaluate this project for inclusion in the 2030 plan update.*

13. SR 19 from US 6 to SR 120 – LRP project # 336, Added Travel Lanes from US 6 to SR 120, RFC Date 2016. The District recommends advancing this project to 2012. The District notes that an adjacent industrial complex is growing. The District notes that the corridor would not serve as a true industrial corridor as it would serve as a for work trips to the industrial complex.

    Comment: *The INDOT statewide no-build network shows a LOS "D-E" and a build LOS of "A-B".INDOT will evaluate this project for inclusion in the 2030 plan update. The INDOT planning section will evaluate this propose project advancement for the 2030 plan update.*

14. SR 15 from US 20 to SR 120 – The District requests a corridor study for SR 15 in general but suggests moving the entire alignment that traverses through the small town of Bristol in Elkhart County to the east of its current location in order to properly align with SR 15 north of SR 120. INDOT currently list a TSM improvement on SR 120 in Bristol, INDOT project ID # 643, from West jct with SR 120 to east jct with SR 120, connecting the two SR 15 segments. The District notes that ROW on SR 120 segment is extremely tight and essentially connects SR 15 south of 120 to SR 15 north of 120 (a 0.25mile segment); realigning the segments would reduce ROW restraints and improve the connectivity of SR 15 through Bristol.

    Comment: *No Comments*

15. US 224 from 0.5 miles West of I-69 to I-69 – The District proposes Added Travel Lanes or Median Construction for this segment. The District notes that industrial growth is anticipated in the long term and recommends a "Placeholder" project for the 2023-2025 time frame. The District anticipates development pressure for this project as US 224 is currently being marketed as an industrial corridor. The District notes that locals looking to develop adjacent land as an industrial area.

    Comment: *The INDOT statewide build network shows a LOS "C" by 2030 which is considered unacceptable for a rural area. INDOT will evaluate the recommended improvement to be included into the INDOT 2030 plan update.*

16. US 20 from I-69 to SR 127 (Angola) – INDOT currently list this project in our current plan as INDOT project # 527, Added Travel Lanes, RFC Date 2018. The District would like to advance this project, but did not suggest an actual advancement date. The District also supports an Angola Bypass Study.

    Comment: *The INDOT planning section will follow-up with The District to obtain a recommended advancement date and evaluate the proposal for the 2030 plan update. The planning section will also evaluate the district's recommendation/support for an Angola Bypass.*

PLANNING ISSUES

- Heavy Duty Truck Routes – The District notes that elected officials has designated portions of US 30, SR 9, and US 6 as heavy duty routes. The District notes that legislation has been passed relative to this designation and recommend "Placeholder" projects be included in the LRP for these corridors in order to upgrade these facilities to handle heavy duty trucks. The District notes that US 30 should be in good shape to handle the heavier loads, but SR 9 and US 6 will need to be upgrade, otherwise the would essential become gravel roads overtime. The planning section notes that this action adds to Indiana's Heavy Duty Truck Network. The District then asked if the projects should be coded as J300 or J400 work code types. The planning section replied the district will need to discuss this with the Programming and Pavement Management Section. The District notes he plan on proposing these projects in this year's call for projects and feel that SR 9 and US 6 won't last 8-10 year before rubblizing.

- SR 930 Interchange at Washington Blvd. The District notes that this interchange is outdated in deficient and notes it is impossible to maintain and needs to be updated. Relinquishment issues for the corridor could be an issue if this project is proposed. The proposal could be part of the relinquishment process.

OTHER ISSUES

- None