

MEMORANDUM

- | |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Information Only |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Project Specific |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Memo - File With |

TO: File
FROM: Leslie Trobaugh, Strand Associates, Inc.
DATE: April 25, 2006
RE: INDOT US 50 Corridor Planning Study and Environmental Assessment
CC: Tim Lawson, Doe Anderson

This date a public information meeting was held from 6 p.m.-8 p.m. at the Lawrenceburg High School, in Lawrenceburg, Indiana. Representing INDOT: Mary Jackman, Frank Baukert, Jim Ude, Marvin Jenkins; Strand Associates: Scott Roush, Leslie Trobaugh; Doe Anderson: Tim Lawson; M-E: Erin Peterson, Brian Forscher.

Public information meetings are held to create an informal opportunity for local residents to participate in the process of implementing projects that affect their communities. The next public information meeting for the US 50 Corridor Study is tentatively scheduled for September 2006; at that time proposed alternatives will be presented for public comment.

Mary Jackman briefly explained the comment process and the agenda for the evening. Scott Roush then summarized the study process (see power point presentation listed on this website). Erin Peterson discussed the Gateway Study, which is a separate, but complementary study focused on land use and access management for the US 50 corridor. A question and answer period followed the presentations. A representative selection of questions/responses follows:

- Will other connections to US 50, such as SR 1 be studied since these other roads impact traffic on US 50? Response- Other roads will be looked at to the extent that we examine traffic patterns on the corridor; where is US 50 traffic coming from and where does it want to go. The focus is US 50 and what we can do to ease the problems along this route
- What is an acceptable number of access points to have on US 50? Some businesses could be reached from roads behind the building – will you look at that? Response- Access points along the corridor are evaluated based on how they affect traffic flow, accident rates and congestion. It seems pretty clear that the number of access points along the corridor from Aurora through Lawrenceburg contributes to the problems. One possible solution could certainly be access via alternate roads. Impacts to current land use along those alternate routes would have to be examined.
- People are used to hearing the word “study” and seeing nothing happen. Could smaller solutions be implemented quickly, then it would help the public feel something was being done? Response – There will be both short-term and long-term solutions developed. Low impact, less expensive improvements could be implemented much more quickly by the local INDOT district.

The alternatives that are large dollar, off-route items, for example a new road, would take much more time and more in depth study. This study will allow INDOT to move forward with evaluating the more complex solutions without having to go back to developing a purpose and need, which can be time consuming.

- What will happen when Tanner's Creek Bridge is worked on? Will detours be created? Response –Various scenarios will be examined, including the increased cost to traffic for any detour, impacts to traffic due to lane closures, etc. This crossing is so important to the community, any solution will focus on as little disruption to traffic flow as possible.
- How did you determine future traffic volumes? Cincinnati residents are looking to get away from the crime, etc., and looking across the river to Dearborn County. Response – A generalized growth factor was used. Data from other studies such as Dearborn County's Transportation Assessment were reviewed. A Travel Demand Model is being developed which is a computer model that can be used to test possible solutions and traffic flow. It is possible that after the Model is completed that some of the projected traffic volumes for 2031 could go up or down

The question and answer period closed with an invitation for anyone interested in becoming a member of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) to leave their contact information with Tim Lawson so that they could be notified of the next CAC meeting. Displays of the resource map and the Gateway Study, which is being executed by another consultant, were available for public inspection both prior to and after the meeting.