



# I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies

## **Section 2 CAC Summary**

**Location:** Section 2 Project Office

**Date/Time:** Thursday, August 4, 2005

**Subject:** Revisions to Preliminary Alternative and Proposed Interchanges

**Participants:** 15 members and 2 alternates attended the meeting. See attachment

### **Introduction:**

#### **Agenda Item 1 – Welcome**

John McCarthy opened the meeting and provided the CAC with an overview of the agenda for the evening. He explained that the information presented at the CAC would be the same information that Section 2 would present to the public at the PIM on August 9, 2005. The purpose of both meetings was to solicit input on the revised preliminary alignments and interchange locations.

#### **Agenda Item 2 - Environmental and Cultural Resource Field Work Update**

J. McCarthy summarized the activities underway or completed since the last meeting. He emphasized that in Section 2 there would not be a need to displace any potential historical register properties.

#### **Agenda Item 3- Refinements to Preliminary Alignments and Interchange Locations and Types**

J. McCarthy explained that the maps being used tonight reflect some of the changes made to the preliminary alternatives and to the interchanges since the last CAC meeting. In general they would see five interchange locations with approximate spacing of 6 miles. FHWA prefers a distance of 7 to 10 miles between interchanges, he further explained and stated that the 6 miles was close to that preference. The group was told that alignments A & B were equal at this point and that no preferred has been selected. The team is interested in getting feedback from members and the general public on their preferences between A & B within each of the 9 different subsections of the corridor shown on the maps. The best alignment within each subsection will be combined to form a composite preferred alignment. Besides input from the public, the team will conduct an “impact evaluation” to help determine the preferred.



# I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies

J. McCarthy then explained each of the 13 maps that would be shown at the public meeting, highlighting any changes that may have occurred in the alignments or the interchanges since the last meeting. Each change was explained and potential impacts and benefits highlighted.

The group was then asked to offer any comments or questions they may have. Following is a summary.

Q. When will a final decision be made? Will it take several weeks or months?

A. After the team has received the comments from the public and completed the required evaluations, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) will be published. The public will have an opportunity to review the document through various venues prior to a public hearing. It will be several months before the DEIS is available to the public.

Q. Why is there not an interchange shown on each of the alignments at the Division Street location? It's the only sheet that only shows one alternative interchange?

A. The same interchange design could be applied to either of the alignments shown and if you would prefer the interchange be located on alignment A, then you should let us know that.

Q. What happens to the old US 50 by-pass?

A. Randy Hancock stated that there are plans for extending US 50 to the east, which is on the State's TIP plan. Randy also explained INDOT restricts access (curb cuts) within 1,200 feet of an interchange. Therefore the map shows a relocated US 50 to the south that only provides a few access points. It was also asked whether the state would consider "giving" old US 50 to the county. John McCarthy stated that he could not answer that question at this time. The details would have to be worked out between the county and the state at a later date.

Q. Who decides what interchanges stay or go and where they are located?

A. John McCarthy stated that INDOT ultimately decides the interchange locations, once they have received public input on the alternatives. John also stated that BLA is currently working on future traffic projections, which may affect the decision on interchange locations.

Q. Will the connector road to IPL (North Petersburg interchange) be a state route?

A. John McCarthy stated that that decision has not been made yet and that INDOT would ultimately make the final decision. Randy Hancock added that any required spur connectors will be designated a state route (i.e. SR 157) and maintained by INDOT.



# I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies

Q. Explain the North Petersburg interchange and “why IPL where they could build a new road on their own property”. (I don’t understand the second part of this question, so I’m not sure how to revise it)

A. John McCarthy stated that the connector road to SR 57 was placed halfway between the main entrance to IPL and Blackburn Road. He stated that if a private road was built on IPL and/or Hoosier Energy property then access to and from I-69 could be made without the trucks making any type of turning movement.

Q. Will the 6-mile separation of interchanges be acceptable?

A. McCarthy explained FHWA’s general rule of keeping rural interstate interchanges 7-10 miles apart. John stated that traffic, supporting economic development and diverting truck traffic would play an important role in deciding interchange locations. Cost would also be a factor.

Q. What is the justification for realigning SR 61?

A. John McCarthy again said that INDOT’s 1,200’ restriction would eliminate curb cuts to existing businesses, houses, and the church. 1,200 feet to either side of the interchange will need to be closed and traffic diverted to the rear of these properties in order to control access if the interchange is placed on SR 61.

Q. What about church access at Hwy. 61?

A. Keeping SR 61 where it is today would force the businesses/church/residences to use rear access.

Q. Will clearance over the county roads adjacent to the White River be maintained for farm equipment?

A. John McCarthy stated that clearance will be maintained so that farm equipment will be able to cross beneath the bridge structure.

Q. What’s the rationale for the south Washington interchange?

A. John McCarthy explained that the south Washington interchange offers better access to the south, center, and west parts of the city at the US 50 interchange, thereby avoiding adverse travel, especially for trips to and from the south on I-69. At the south Washington interchange, access to SR 57 and the southern edge of the city (where development is occurring) would be more direct.



# I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies

## **Conclusion and Action Items:**

J. McCarthy encouraged everyone to attend the public information meeting and adjourned the CAC.

---

*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, John McCarthy.*

Attachment



# I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies

Section 2 CAC Meeting #4 Attendance  
August 4, 2005

<b>CAC Member Organization</b>	<b>Representative</b>
Davies Co. Indiana Growth Council	Ron Arnold
Daviess County Chamber of Commerce	Charles Shelby
Philip Flint	Daviess County Farm Bureau
Larry Adams	Pike County Farm Bureau
Alycia Church	Pike County Chamber of Commerce
Mayor Jon Craig	City of Petersburg
Pike Co. Economic Growth & Development	Paul Lake
Pike County EMA	Ernie Hume
Pike Co. Board of Commissioners	Mark Flint
Gibson Co. Board of Commissioners	Sherrell Marginet
Patoka River National Wildlife Refuge	Bill McCoy
Daviess County Sheriff's Dept.	Chief Deputy Sheriff Steve Cox
Petersburg Ministerial Fellowship	Paul Newton
4 Rivers Resource Conservation and Development	Judy Gray
Hoosier Voices for I-69	Joe Dedman
Tri-CPA	David McBeth (alternate)
City of Washington	Fire Chief Dave Chapman (alternate)

<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Representative</b>
Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT)	Eric Swickard
Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, INC (BLA) <i>Project Management Consultant for corridor (PMC)</i>	Nicole Minton Jim Dittoe (Winning Communities)
Hannum, Wagle & Cline Engineering <i>Project Management for Section 2</i>	Randy Hancock Ron Wilson
Jacobs Civil, Inc.	John McCarthy Tracey Lober Denise Zerillo