



I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies

Section 3 CAC Summary

Location: Washington, Indiana

Date/Time: 3/20/2009 1:00 PM

Subject: Preferred Alternative/Public Hearing

Participants: See attachment

Introduction: David Pluckebaum (Section 3 Project Manager) began the meeting with introductions. Project team members from Corradino LLC and Bernardin-Lochmueller and CAC members introduced themselves.

David Pluckebaum then showed a PowerPoint presentation. This presentation will also be shown at the Public Hearing on March 26, 2009 at the North Daviess Elementary School. David Pluckebaum went over the purpose and need, completed tasks, tasks to be completed, and public involvement efforts. Public involvement efforts have included CAC meetings, public meetings, a project website, and the project office. I-69 is the only INDOT project that has project offices for the public to gather information and give comments.

David Pluckebaum gave an overview of the project. There will be interchanges at SR 58 and at US 231. There will also be an interchange at US 50 but that is part of Section 2's project area. Mr. Pluckebaum went over the alternative analysis process and stated that Alternative 1 is the recommended preferred alternative. He also went over the preferred subsection alternatives and why they were recommended. There are five subsections and their recommended alternatives make up the end to end preferred alternative.

David Pluckebaum went over access options at CR 350N; CR 750N to CR 900N; CR 1400N, and the US 231 interchange.

CR 350N

At CR 350N three options were presented. Option 1 would be an overpass at CR 350N; Option 2 would be no overpass at CR 350N; and Option 3 would be no overpass at CR 350N but there would be a frontage road from CR 350E to CR 350N.

A CAC member commented he would like the frontage road located to the west of I-69, shown at CR 250E be moved to the west and connect with CR 200E to improve airport



I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis

Tier 2 Studies

access (Note: the frontage road shown at CR 250E is a different frontage road than the one from CR 350E to CR 350N under option 3). Another CAC member mentioned that CR 350N is not used much to go to Washington. When the CAC was asked whether anyone thought CR 350N needed an overpass no one said yes.

CR 750N to CR 900N

At CR 750N to CR 900N three options were presented. Option 1 would be have overpasses at CR 750N, CR 800N and CR 900N; Option 2 would be to have overpasses at CR 750N and CR 800N but not at CR 900N; and Option 3 would be to have overpasses at CR 800N and CR 900N but not at CR 750N. At CR 750N there would be a frontage road from CR 750N to CR 450E. In interviews with emergency responders it had been stated that CR 800N was the most important for them to remain open. In all three options that road is shown has having an overpass.

A CAC member commented they thought all three overpasses should be included. Another CAC member commented they liked Option 3 that had overpasses at CR 800N and 900N with a frontage road at CR 750 N (Note: a second CAC member after the meeting stated they also liked this option after looking at the maps). Another CAC member commented that if CR 900N did not have an overpass an access road from CR 900N to CR 1000N on the Epsom side of the interstate (the east side) would be helpful.

An Amish CAC member mentioned during discussion prior to the presentation that if an overpass between CR 750N and CR 900N was to be eliminated he preferred the option that eliminated the overpass at CR 900 N and kept an overpass at CR 750 N because the Amish in that area need an overpass more than those in Epsom need one at CR 900 N. The CR 750 N overpass was important because the Amish which will be located west of I-69 are part of an Amish district located east of I-69. The same CAC member, who lives in Epsom, also suggested that if CR 900 N is closed that a new county road be constructed north out of Epsom that would lead up to CR 1000 N.

A CAC member asked if the County planned to pave CR 800N all the way through the County. It was mentioned that there are no east-west county roads currently paved all the way through. It was mentioned that CR 550N would be more likely to be paved all the way through the County first.

CR 1400N

At CR 1400N two options were presented. Option 1 would be an overpass at CR 1400N; and Option 2 would be no overpass at CR 1400N. There would be overpasses at the county roads to the north and south of CR 1400N under both options.



I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis

Tier 2 Studies

A CAC member commented that most people use CR 1400N from Odon in order to avoid the SR 58 traffic. Another CAC member stated the County Commissioner from that area should be contacted for his opinion on that road. A CAC member stated that either the north-south road to the west of the interstate (CR 500E) or CR 1400N should be kept open. It was stated the preferred alternative in the DEIS shows CR 500E closed at SR 58 because of how close it is to the I-69 interchange ramps.

US 231

At US 231 three interchange options were presented. Option 1 would be a full diamond interchange; Option 2 would be a single point interchange; and Option 3 would be a tight diamond interchange. A full diamond interchange would require more acres and would have a greater environmental impact than the other two. The single point and the tight diamond interchange options would have the same footprint and environmental impacts. The full diamond would provide more room for additional capacity modifications if ever needed.

A CAC member commented they like Option 3 (the tight diamond) because it has less impact than the Option 1 (the full diamond) and they like the tight diamond better than the single point (Option 2). Another CAC member asked why the full diamond would be considered if it has more impacts and is more expensive. David Pluckebaum answered a full diamond is being considered because they are traditional in rural areas and loops can be added if more capacity was needed in the future. It was asked if a tight diamond could be improved if more capacity was needed in the future. David Pluckebaum said a tight diamond could be improved by adding dual turn lanes and other measures if needed in the future. Note: the traffic analysis for the peak hour of traffic for the US 231 interchange in 2030 shows all of the ramps and intersections with US 231 will operate at level of service (LOS) A or B. LOS is measured based on grades of A through F with A being the best grade and F being the worst. Another CAC member stated they liked the tight diamond because it has fewer impacts and would not be as confusing as the single point interchange.

After access issues were discussed a CAC member asked how the preferred rest area location was picked. David Pluckebaum stated factors such as how close utility access would be, how close the planned interchanges would be, visual impacts on historic sites, and environmental impacts were factors in picking a preferred location. A CAC member commented that a rest area could help tourism and that tourist information could be placed there. David Pluckebaum mentioned that the construction of the rest area may be deferred. A CAC member stated that if the rest area was deferred the bridge for the rest area interchange could be built early along current CR 1100N and act as an overpass for CR 1100N and would keep CR 1100N open until the rest area was constructed.



I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies

After the rest area was discussed David Pluckebaum went over the remaining schedule. The Final EIS (FEIS) is expected in the fall of 2009. The FEIS will respond to comments about the Draft EIS. The comment period for the DEIS ends on June 8, 2009. The Record of Decision (ROD) for the project is expected around the end of 2009. Design is expected from 2009 to 2013. Right-of-way acquisition is proposed for 2010-2014 and construction is proposed for 2011-2015. It was mentioned that the road might not be built from south to north. Building certain sections early might be more practical and economical. A CAC member asked where Section 4 is in their schedule. David Pluckebaum answered that Section 4 is not as far as long as Section 2 or 3. Major Moves provided money to build Sections 1 through 3 so there has been a push to get them done earlier.

The discussions described in this summary provide a meeting overview and do not create an obligation or commitment for final project decisions.

This meeting summary represents the project team's understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments to the project manager's attention, David Pluckebaum.



I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies

Attachment
Section 3 CAC Meeting # 4 Attendance
March 20, 2009

CAC Member Organization	Representative
Washington-Daviess County Airport	Bob Barron
Hoosier Voices for I-69	Joe Wellman
Greene County Farm Bureau Inc.	Gary Heshelman
Daviess County Economic Development Corp.	Richard Cottrell
Daviess County Chamber of Commerce	Charles Selby
Daviess County Highway	Larry McLin and Phil Cornelius
Daviess County Commissioners	Tony Wichman
Daviess County Farm Service Agency	Darla Norris
Epsom Community Representative	Kenneth Wagler
Community Representative	Nick Graber
Greene County Economic Development Corp.	Joan Bethell

Project Team	Representative
Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, INC (BLA) <i>Project Management Consultant for corridor (PMC)</i>	David Goffinet
The Corradino Group <i>Project Management for Section 3</i>	David Pluckebaum, P.M. David Cleveland Richard Ray Kirk Roth Todd Johnson