



## I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

### *Tier 2 Access Coordination Team Meeting* Thursday, October 12, 2006, 10:00 a.m. EDT

Attendees:	
Anthony DeSimone – FHWA	Brian Litherland – BLA/PMC
Ed Ratulowski – FHWA	Jim Gulick – BLA/PMC
Michelle Hilary – INDOT, OES	Kent Ahrenholtz – BLA/PMC
Gary Mroczka – INDOT, Prod. Mgt.	Roger J. Wade – Qk4/Section 1
Ben Lawrence – INDOT	Maurice Heitzman – Qk4/Section 1
Brad Steckler – INDOT	Tracey Lober – Jacobs Civil/Section 2
Tom Seeman – INDOT	Randy Hancock – HWC/Section 2
David Butts – INDOT	David Pluckebaum – Corradino/Section 3
Nick Batta – INDOT	David Cleveland – Corradino/Section 3
Michelle Allen – INDOT (via conf. call)	Jason Bowers – Corradino/Section 3
April Arroyo-Monroe – INDOT Vincennes Dist. (via conf. call)	Kevin Jasinski – American Consulting
Britney Smith – INDOT Vincennes Dist. (via conf. call)	Jarvis Jointer – American Consulting
Daniel Townsend – BLA/PMC	

#### **Introductions and Opening Remarks**

The meeting began after opening with introductions; Kent Ahrenholtz described the purpose of the meeting:

- Discussing details of access issues for Sections 1, 2, & 3.

#### **Review of Tier 2 Access Guidelines**

#### **Approval Process**

The approval process will flow from the PMC to INDOT: Gary Mroczka & Brad Steckler and/or John Weaver and then on to Phelps Klika.

- Plan with methodology used (Tier 2 Access Guidelines).
- “Draft” recommendation that could change based on DEIS comments.

#### **Review of Tier 2 Sections Access Plans**

##### **Section 1**



- SR 68, SR 168, SR 64 are all diamond interchanges.

*Q: Will the diamond interchanges have wide footprint?*

A: Yes they will be with wide footprint.

*Q: Was the only change deleting N-S CR 875 grade separation?*

A: Yes, deleted CR 875 grade separation. We also added grade separation at Tepe Road (result of Public Input).

*Q: The I-64 Overpass was also deleted?*

A: Yes it was removed.

*Q: The median at I-64 is narrowed?*

A: We are documenting full build-out, but will be phasing.

*Q: Has FHWA reviewed the I-64 Interchange?*

A: Yes. It is a Level III design exception.

*Q: Inside shoulder a design exception?*

A: No design exception.

*Q: A non-toll access plan?*

A: Yes, proceeding non-toll.

- Materials section went out to I-64 Interchange.
  - Overlay would be sufficient.
  - Still waiting for additional testing results.
- Sufficient clearance for bridges: 16 foot 6 inch.

### Section 1 Design Build

- Using 1100 foot limited access.
- Eliminated access roads 1 and 2 (based on cost justification).
- Keeping access road 3.
- Access roads 1 and 2 are not warranted.
- Keep access roads in environmental document.

### Section 1 (cont.)

- Purpose of Access Road #5  
Maintains continuity of CR 550E,  
N-S road

*Q: CR 525E cul-de-sacs just north of SR 68?*



## I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

A: Yes.

Q: Value Engineering of SR 68 Interchange?

A: Several million more to take I-69 over; adding additional span for stream.

- Looking at an alternate design for SR 68. Will need to look at this in more detail.
- Existing SR 68/SR 57 intersection improvements; may become part of American Consulting's contract.
- Toyota traffic uses SR 68.

Q: Why do you have overpasses at CR 400S and CR 350S?

A: Because of the CR 450S wildlife crossing (8' by 24'), to maintain network connectivity, Section 1 will revisit the CR 450S/wildlife crossing vs. cost of the CR 925

Q: At SR 64, are all properties being bought?

A: No, only two properties; have access to CR 950E.

C: Look at 900 foot limited access control: prime area for development, extend access control to intersection – FHWA preference, have to decide if the 900 foot access control would reduce costs, reduction in interchange footprint.

### Section 2

- Interchanges at SR 61, North Pike, South Daviess, US 50.
- North Pike Interchange
  - 650 coal trucks/day to power plants
- Diamond interchanges at all locations: wide footprint.

Q: How strong is the desire for the North Pike Interchange?

A: Local officials are backing this interchange: amount of coal truck traffic; Petersburg is annexing in the future to north and adding an Industrial Park; maybe buy interchange property and locals build access road; maybe should label as future interchange.

- South Daviess Interchange
  - Has the Mayor's support, but no Economic Development plans.
  - In relation to North Pike Interchange: spell out the positives and negatives and maybe INDOT buy the ROW and the locals pay for everything.

Q: Why are you relocating SR 61 for interchange?

A: There are many factors: including local access, improving SR 61 curves, and properties.

Q: Does existing SR 61 meet the standards?

A: Yes it does.



C: Want to see the costs and impacts for the interchange on SR 61?

- Item #7: 3R vs. 4R: design standards
  - Interchange crossroads as 4R
  - Grade separations as 3R
- South Daviess Interchange
  - Why this location - originally at CR 50, but development is occurring, proximity to SR 57, and located between rural pockets of development.
  - Why not put interchange at CR 300S - transmission lines: cost of relocating transmissions lines vs. the cost of all bridges and access roads.
  - Why not slide interchange to the south - impacts to cemetery and church
  - Why improvements to CR 50W - design standards
  - Why not use CR 375S impacts to cemetery and church
  - Should look more at the South Daviess Interchange - see if there is a way to reduce costs and impacts: configuration and location
  - The Access Committee gave their approval for Section 2 to move forward with the above. Should also look at something besides a diamond (Brad Steckler); look no further north than CR 300S, and south of CR 50W.
- US 50 Interchange
  - Will have signalized intersections

Q: Are loops and ramps warranted?

A: US 50 is a NHS route.

Q: What about partial cloverleaves?

A: Significant, 29,000 vehicles on US 50.

Q: What about planned signal at Old US 50?

A: No, it has a flasher.

C: The volumes on the table of the Access Guidelines table need clarification.

- Summary of Section 2 Interchanges:
  - Gather information on SR 61 on existing.
  - North Pike: recommend as future potential
  - South Daviess: look at shifting north/south, design considerations
  - US 50: review traffic and partial cloverleaf

### Section 3 (US 50 to US 231)

- Interchanges at SR 58 and US 231
- Discussion of interchanges and grade separations
- Non-motorized crossings: there was a question of using culverts



**Q:** Why grade separation at CR 750N? Can some be eliminated?

**A:** Corradino kept all grade separations from Tier 1: the 3 grade separations are in the vicinity of CR 750N. May be able to eliminate the grade separation at CR 800N; historic property.

### Section 3 Rest Area

- Looked at two locations: CR 1000N and CR 1100N (*CR 1000N area is the recommended*).
  - Diamond vs. Trumpet configuration
  - RA Committee decided on a one rest stop facility

**Q:** Will the utilities be in the EIS or in the AI later?

**A:** The utilities corridor will be included in the EIS.

- Should use round-abouts at the ramp terminals.
- Corradino is only looking at 84 acres, not actual rest area design.
- Discussed benefits of moving to CR 1100N:
  - Cost savings of utilities
  - Moving away from McCall Family Farmstead
  - Moving off previously mined area
  - Negative aspect: moving closer to SR 58
- Showing both RAs in the DEIS.
- Show CR 1100N as the preferred.

### Section 3 (cont.)

- SR 58 Interchange
  - I-69 over vs. SR 58 over

**Q:** Can CR 500E be cul-de-saced?

**A:** Corradino agreed with Gary Mroczka on the cul-de-sac.

- Maybe lessen 1200 foot ram spacing.
- Discussion on ramp spacing.
- US 231 Interchange
  - Topography description – interchange sits in a hole.
  - US 231 will be relocated on fill with I-69 over it.
  - Relocated SR 45/58 intersection with US 231.
  - Impact to Doans Creek.
  - One option looked at offset ramp spacing.
  - Spacing issue between ramp and SR 45/58 relocation.
  - Offset ramp spacing did not provide as much benefits as hoped.
  - Question of a folded diamond.



## I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

---

- May want to look again at the urban single point or the tight diamond.
- Truck traffic associated with Crane.
- Need to increase spacing between ramp and SR 45/48 relocation – atleast from 300 feet to a minimum of 600 feet.
- Need to look at a full single point interchange.
- Summary of Section 3 Interchanges:
  - SR 58: carry forward with 1200 feet spacing
  - US 231: look at single point, add spacing to wide interchange (to SR 45/58 relocation), throw-out off-set ramp spacing.

### Other Access Issues

#### Relinquishments

- Need to discuss now.
- PMC (Kent Ahrenholtz) and INDOT (Tom Seeman) to meet with Jaime G. and Mary (?).

### Next Steps

- Provide Section 1 recommendations to INDOT.
- Refinements to Sections 2 and 3.

### Next Meeting

Review of Sections 4, 5 & 6 Access Plans – Spring 2007.

*Details discussed in this meeting are subject to change, but are a reflection of how things stood at the close of the meeting.*

*These meeting minutes represent my understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments or revisions to my attention, Carol Hood.*

**Note: This meeting summary documents ongoing, internal agency deliberations. Accordingly, the information contained in this summary is considered to be pre-decisional and deliberative.**



## I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

### Internal Memorandum, Section 3

#### Access Committee Meeting

October 12, 2006, 10:00am

#### Additional Meeting Summary Information Prepared by Corradino

The following information supplements the official meeting minutes prepared by BLA.

1. **Brief Review of 8-8-06 Alternatives Meeting:** Corradino briefly reviewed the decisions made at the 8-8-06 Alternatives Meeting held at INDOT Central Office and attended by representatives of INDOT, FHWA, BLA, and Corradino. Key recommendations from the 8-8-06 Alternatives Meeting that are relevant to the Access Committee include:
  - a. **Daviess CR 350 N:** Eliminate the potential interchange from further consideration;
  - b. **Daviess CR 1000 N:** Eliminate the potential interchange from further consideration;
  - c. **Odon/Elnora Interchange:** Eliminate the potential Daviess CR 1400 N and Daviess CR 1500 N interchange locations (interchange will be located at SR 58 as identified in the Tier 1 Study) and eliminate the potential rerouted SR 58, from the SR 58/SR 358 junction north to SR 57 in Elnora to parallel the west side of I-69, from further consideration;
  - d. **Rest Area:** Eliminate the potential Daviess CR 200 N location from further consideration. Add the Daviess CR 1100 N location to be investigated along with the Daviess CR 1000 N location. Investigate a diamond configuration for the ramps serving the rest area as well as the original trumpet configuration; and
  - e. **US 231 Interchange:** Further investigate two configurations: 1) a spread diamond with 1200' (sized to accommodate future loops if ever needed) between ramp junctions centered on mainline I-69, and 2) a diamond with 800' between ramp junctions centered south of mainline I-69 to minimize impacts to Doans Creek and wetlands.

Corradino led a detailed discussion of each of these recommendations from the 8-8-06 Alternatives Meeting, as well as other items.

2. **Potential Interchange at Daviess CR 350 N:** The Access Committee decided to eliminate this location from further consideration.

3. **Potential Interchange at Daviess CR 1000 N:** The Access Committee decided to eliminate this location from further consideration.
4. **Odon/Elnora Interchange:** The Access Committee decided to eliminate the potential Daviess CR 1400 N and CR 1500 N interchange locations, as well as the potential rerouting of SR 58 along the west side of I-69 from further consideration. A diamond interchange will be provided at SR 58. The projected 2030 traffic volumes at the SR 58 interchange are low. If a diamond with 1200' spacing (large enough to accommodate future loops if ever needed) is centered on the mainline I-69, there would be only 380' between the west ramp junction and Daviess CR 500 E. There would be 900' spacing between the east ramp junction and Daviess CR 550 E. The Odon City water wells are located in the southwest (SW) quadrant of SR 58 and Daviess CR 500E and the Daviess County School facilities are located in the NE quadrant of SR 58 and Daviess CR 550 E.

There was discussion concerning priority of spacing within the interchange between ramp junctions versus spacing between the ramp junctions and adjacent intersections on either side of the interchange. The Access Committee decided to keep the proposed 1200' spacing between ramp junctions and to allow the 900' spacing between the east ramp junction and Daviess CR 550 E. Limited access right-of-way could extend east of Daviess CR 550 E if desired. The SR 58/Daviess CR 550 E intersection is a three-legged intersection. The Access Committee decided that 390' spacing between the west ramp junction and Daviess CR 500 E is not adequate and discussed the option of dead-ending (with cul-de-sacs) Daviess CR 500 E on the north and south sides of SR 58 versus relocating a portion of Daviess CR 500 E further to the west to provide more spacing. Projected traffic volumes on Daviess CR 500 E are very low and any rerouting of the road would occur in the area of the Odon wells and likely require a residential relocation north of SR 58. The Access Committee decided to dead-end Daviess CR 500 E on each side of SR 58. Coordination with the Odon water utility is desirable.

5. **Rest Area:** Corradino discussed the benefits of locating the rest area in the NE quadrant of I-69/Daviess CR 1100 N versus in the SW quadrant of I-69/Daviess CR 1000 N. These benefits include:
  - a. Moves the rest area one mile further from the Town of Epsom and effectively eliminates it from the line of site by locating it behind two separate wooded areas;
  - b. Moves it approximately 1.5 miles closer to water and sewer service, which could reduce offsite utility extension costs by as much as \$500,000;
  - c. The Daviess CR 1000 N site was strip mined as recently as 15 years ago. No strip mining has occurred at the Daviess CR 1100 N site, which is beneficial because of the large proposed pavement areas and building foundations;
  - d. Moves the rest area one mile further from the McCall Family farmstead, which is eligible for listing in the National Register. The Daviess CR 1000 N provides slightly more than one mile of separation from the McCall Family Farmstead; however, this is not as critical as the previously eliminated Daviess CR 200 N potential rest area location was, with its slightly more than one mile

separation from the eligible Daviess County Historic Home District, since the McCall Family Farmstead line of site is not as direct; and

- e. Daviess CR 1000 N is one of the more heavily traveled county roads in the area, and Daviess CR 1100 N is proposed to be dead-ended with the construction of I-69 anyway. Putting the rest area at Daviess CR 1100 N allows the county road network to better remain intact.

The only drawback to the Daviess CR 1100 N location discussed at the 8-8-06 Alternatives Meeting was that it only has two miles of separation from the SR 58 interchange. Three mile separation is recommended between rural access points. The question is should a rest area be considered an access point. Corradino commented that the rest area will be an enclosed system with no outside access to I-69. Also, there are no traffic operations such as weaving with the two mile separation scenario. The **Access Committee decided** the rest area will be located in the NE quadrant of I-69 and Daviess CR 1100 N.

When discussing the diamond configuration versus the trumpet configuration, Corradino referred to a 9-12-06 e-mail from Corradino to INDOT illustrating that the diamond should very effectively handle projected traffic volumes well beyond year 2030. Corradino discussed benefits of the diamond configuration which include:

- f. Better driver expectancy since the majority of interchanges along I-69 will be diamond configurations;
- g. Semi-directional ramp associated with the trumpet configuration could promote higher speeds entering the rest area where there could be stopped conditions present;
- h. Diamond configuration is cheaper than the trumpet; and
- i. Diamond better accommodates a rest area parcel that abuts mainline I-69, eliminating a strip of privately owned property between I-69 and the rest area.

The **Access Committee decided** to provide a diamond configuration for the rest area.

A question was raised about whether or not the offsite utility routes should be covered in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The **Access Committee Decided** that a utility corridor should be provided along I-69 between the rest area and SR 58 since this corridor will already be included in the EIS.

- 6. **US 231 Interchange:** Corradino discussed exhibits illustrating the two configurations identified in the 8-8-06 Alternatives Meeting to be further investigated: 1) the diamond with 1200' spacing between ramps centered on mainline I-69 and 2) the diamond with 800' spacing between ramps offset to the south of mainline I-69. While the 1200' diamond had the largest impacts to environmental resources such as floodplains, wetlands and required length of stream relocation, Corradino reported that the 800' option did not minimize these impacts as much as originally hoped for (see attached Table 1 for details). Corradino discussed that Doans Creek is a natural, tree lined channel with an approximately 20' width. Minimization of Doans Creek relocation will likely be a key issue for the Resource Agencies.

Corradino explained that with either option, the spacing between the south ramp junction and the relocated SR 45/SR58 junction with US 231 is relatively short, in the 400' range. There is a large wooded hill (greater than 100' of relief) in the SE quadrant of the intersection of the proposed SR 45/SR58 and US 231. This makes it difficult to shift the relocated SR 45/SR58 even further to the south to provide better spacing with the interchange. It could be done, but the associated environmental impacts and cost would be sizeable. Corradino discussed that the spacing works from a pure traffic operations standpoint, and the whole interchange area was analyzed in *Synchro*, with a microsimulation in *SimTraffic*. INDOT commented that this spacing is not adequate.

Corradino mentioned that two configurations were eliminated in the 8-8-06 Alternatives Meeting: 1) a tight diamond and 2) a single point urban interchange (SPUI) because they were considered to be urban interchanges and not appropriate for this location. INDOT and FHWA commented that while these configurations are typically found in urban areas, circumstances such as environmental constraints or spacing to adjacent intersections allow these configurations to be investigated for non-urban settings. Corradino commented that the tight diamond and the SPUI in this instance have identical footprints and impacts to environmental resources. Some of the disadvantages typically associated with SPUIs when comparing them to tight diamonds do not hold in this instance because I-69 is proposed to bridge over US 231 and it will be a sizeable structure no matter what configuration is chosen. The bridge costs will be the same for both. Corradino is proposing a four lane section for the portion of US 231 to be reconstructed as part of the I-69 project to accommodate future four-laning of US 231 from I-69 south. A cross section that accommodates SPUIs will be incorporated instead of the typical rural four lane divided cross section. This will also greatly reduce the length US 231 reconstruction to be done as part of the I-69 project. The advantage of the SPUI for this case is that it provides more spacing between the ramp junction and the intersection of relocated SR45/SR58 and US 231.

The Access Committee decided that the diamond with 1200' spacing and the SPUI should be carried forward into the Draft EIS (DEIS), and that Resource Agency and public comment will be sought. The diamond with 800' ramp spacing, offset to the south of mainline I-69, was eliminated from further consideration.

###

*Details discussed in this meeting are subject to change, but are a reflection of how things stood at the close of the meeting.*

*These meeting minutes represent my understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments or revisions to my attention, David Cleveland via [dcleveland@corradino.com](mailto:dcleveland@corradino.com) or the address below.*

Guidelines	SR 58	US 231
1 Ability to Meet Purpose and Need (high, medium, low ranking)	High. Carries the second highest traffic volume (US 231 is 1 <sup>st</sup> ) of any proposed I-69 S-line in the project area. Provides east-west access to I-69 from 7 counties. Provides an I-69/SR 57 connector for north-south traffic in western Indiana.	High. Carries the highest traffic volume of any proposed I-69 S-line in the project area. North-south corridor extending from Ohio River to Lake Michigan. Access to Crane - major employer in Southern Indiana and area with growth potential.
2 Spacing Guidelines		
Greater than 3 miles	Yes**	Yes
Actual spacing on both sides	13/9***	9/11
3 Functional Classification	Rural Major Collector	Rural Other Principal Arterial
4 Road Jurisdiction	INDOT	INDOT
5 NHS Designation	No	Yes
6 INDOT Long-Range Plan Designation	Local Access Corridor	Regional Corridor, Commerce Corridor, and NHS STRAHNET Connection
7 Traffic Volume		
Cross Road Total ADT	6,010	11,920
Ramp Totals	5,500	7,840
8 Site Topography	Flat	Rolling
9 Trip Type (regional vs local)	Local/Regional	Local/Regional

\* The only locations where Interchanges are being considered in the DEIS are SR 58 and US 231, and Interchanges at both of these locations are proposed for all four end-to-end alternatives.

\*\* One of the proposed rest area locations is 2 miles south of the SR 58 interchange. This is less than the minimum desired 3 mile spacing for rural access points; however, the rest area is fully contained within the I-69 freeway system and access is not permitted at this location to I-69 from the local road network.

Table 6-3: Section 3 - AADT Traffic Volume Summary (Year 2030)\*

Scenario	Interchange (Crossroad)	Sum of all 4 Ramps	Mainline		Crossroad	
			North of Interchange NB	SB	East of Interchange	West of Interchange
All Alternatives 1, 2, 3 and 4	SR58	5,500	9,860	9,740	3,220	6,010
Scenario	Interchange (Crossroad)	Sum of all 4 Ramps	Mainline		Crossroad	
			East of Interchange EB	WB	North of Interchange	South of Interchange
All Alternatives 1, 2, 3 and 4	US 231	7,840	12,210	12,040	5,940	11,920

\* The only locations where Interchanges are being considered in the DEIS are SR 58 and US 231, and interchanges at both of these locations are proposed for all four end-to-end alternatives. All interchange configurations being considered are diamond configurations, and the forecasted ramp volumes do not vary among the various interchange configurations.

**Table 1: US 231 Interchange Configurations  
Comparison of Potential Environmental Impacts**

EVALUATION FACTORS	Diamond with 120' Spacing Between Ramps	Diamond with 300' Spacing Between Ramps (Offset)
Estimated Construction Cost Difference	Base*	Base + \$2,000,000
Relocations		
Residences	4	4
Farm Operations	0	0
Commercial	1	1
Parks, Churches, and Cemeteries	0	0
Floodplains Crossing (acres) IDNR DFIRM Database 2004	10.6	8.1
Wetlands (acres)		
Emergent, Forested, Scrub Shrub, or Open Pond	7.7	7.2
Jurisdictional Streams (linear feet)		
Perennial	2,640	1,860
Intermittent	0	0
Ephemeral	2,890	2,590
Total	5,530	4,450
Farmland Impacts		
Acquired for ROW (acres)	88.6	80.3
Threatened/Endangered Species	0	0
Historic Resources 4(f) / (Section 106)		
National Register Listed and Eligible	0	0
Archaeologic Resources		
National Register Listed and Eligible	*	*
Hazardous Materials: Possible Sites	0	0
Forest Impacts		
Forested Areas (acres)	31.0	27.3

Note: Values include the mainline within the interchange area.

\* Does not include costs associated with Doans Creek relocation.

**Table 3: Rest Area Locations  
Comparison of Potential Environmental Impacts**

EVALUATION FACTORS	Diamond at Daviess GR 1000 N	Trumpet at Daviess GR 1000 N	Diamond at Daviess GR 1100 N
Estimated Construction Cost Difference	Base	Base + \$1,600,000	Base + \$400,000
Offsite Utility Cost	Base + \$500,000	Base + \$500,000	Base
Relocations	0	0	0
Residences	0	0	0
Farm Operations	0	0	0
Commercial	0	0	0
Parks, Churches, and Cemeteries	0	0	0
Floodplains Crossing (acres) IDNR DFIRM Database 2004	0	0	0
Wetlands (acres) Emergent, Forested, Scrub Shrub, or Open Pond	0	0	0
Jurisdictional Streams (linear feet)	0	0	0
Perennial	1,290	4,630	1,080
Intermittent	0	0	0
Ephemeral	1,290	4,630	1,080
Total			
Farmland Impacts			
Acquired for ROW (acres)	101.9	127.6	105.2
Threatened/Endangered Species	0	0	0
Historic Resources 4(f) / (Section 106)			
National Register Listed and Eligible	0	0	0
Archaeologic Resources	.	.	.
National Register Listed and Eligible			
Hazardous Materials: Possible Sites	0	0	0
Forest Impacts			
Forested Areas (acres)	0	0	0

Note: Values include the mainline within the ramp footprint.

**Table 2: SR 58 Interchange Configurations  
Comparison of Potential Environmental Impacts**

EVALUATION FACTORS	Diamond with 1200' Spacing (SR 58 over SR 58)	Diamond with 1200' Spacing (SR 58 over I-55)
Estimated Construction Cost Difference	Base	Base + \$700,000
Relocations		
Residences	3	3
Farm Operations	0	0
Commercial	0	0
Parks, Churches, and Cemeteries	0	0
Floodplains Crossing (acres) IDNR DFIRM Database 2004	0	0
Wetlands (acres)		
Emergent, Forested, Scrub Shrub, or Open Pond	0	0
Jurisdictional Streams (linear feet)		
Perennial	0	0
Intermittent	1,890	1,910
Ephemeral	0	0
Total	1,890	1,910
Farmland Impacts		
Acquired for ROW (acres)	80.0	85.2
Threatened/Endangered Species	0	0
Historic Resources 4(f) / (Section 106)		
National Register Listed and Eligible	0	0
Archaeologic Resources		
National Register Listed and Eligible	0	0
Section 4(f) (North Daviess School athletic fields)	No	Yes
Hazardous Materials: Possible Sites	0	0
Wellhead Protection Area	Yes	Yes
Forest Impacts		
Forested Areas (acres)	0	0

Note: Values include the mainline within the interchange area.

## I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES (SECTION 3)

Date: May 16, 2007

RE: Access Committee Meeting Response

On October 12, 2006 the Access Committee (Attachment A) held a meeting to discuss access issues related to Section 3. A Meeting Summary for that meeting is attached. The following are the issues that were discussed. There were some items that required further assessment. Corradino recommendations are highlighted.

1. Interchange at Daviess County Road 350 North – this interchange was proposed by local economic development groups.
  - The Access Committee recommended the elimination of this proposed interchange.
  - **The interchange has been eliminated.**
2. Interchange at Daviess County Road 1000 North – this interchange was proposed because of emergency access concerns and concerns about the distance between access from US 50 to SR 58 (14 miles).
  - The Access Committee recommended the elimination of this proposed interchange.
  - **The interchange has been eliminated.**
3. Odon/Elnora Interchange – the Town of Elnora proposed the relocation of the Tier 1 recommended SR 58 location to improve the opportunity for economic development for their community.
  - The Access Committee recommended the interchange remain at SR 58.
  - **The interchange is located at SR 58. There will not be a new connector road running along the western edge of I-69 between SR 58 and SR 57. Daviess County Road 500 East will be closed at SR 58 because the intersection is too close to the interchange ramp intersections.**
4. Rest Area – INDOT added a rest area within Section 3.
  - The Access Committee recommended the rest area be located at Daviess County Road 1100 North and that access be provided with a diamond interchange configuration.
  - **The rest area is located at Daviess County 1100 North but has been moved south of the county road because of environmental concerns. Access will be provided with a diamond interchange configuration and the rest area will be located east of I-69.**
5. US 231 Interchange – two spread (full) diamond interchange configurations were presented to the Access Committee in October 2006, one with a traditional rural configuration of 1200' spacing between ramp junctions and the other with 800' spacing between ramp junctions.
  - The Access Committee recommended the spread (full) diamond with 1200' spacing be included in the DEIS. The Access Committee also recommended a single-point interchange configuration be considered in the DEIS.
  - **The DEIS includes both of the recommended interchange options (full-diamond and single-point). INDOT has concerns about the viability of the single-point option.**



to Greene County Road 100 West due to the location of Mt. Nebo Church and the overall local traffic patterns.

- The elimination of overpass topic was discussed in general terms at the Access Committee. INDOT wanted to see if any of the proposed overpasses could be eliminated or construction delayed until traffic dictates the need for the overpass.
- The DEIS recognizes each of the proposed overpass locations. The DEIS states that these are proposed locations and that final recommendations will be made within the FEIS. Proposed access options will be presented to the public at the Public Hearing and at the project office. Input from the public and local officials will be considered for the final recommendations. The following are the access considerations being considered.
  - i. Daviess County Road 350 North (Attachment C) – an overpass was not included in the Tier 1 Study. A permit for coal mining has been approved by DNR for the area south of CR 350 N. CR 350 E has been approved by the Daviess County Commissioners to be the haul road used by the mining company to access US 50. When mining starts there will be a high volume of trucks using CR 350 E from CR 350 N southward to US 50.
    1. Option 1 as presented in the Tier 1 Study, includes an overpass at Daviess CR 350 East. Daviess CR 350 N will be closed.
    2. Option 2 - An overpass was added at Daviess CR 350 N in Tier 2 because this route was near the Amish area and initial proposals were to provide overpasses at each of the county roads used by the Amish.
    3. Option 3 would eliminate the CR 350 N overpass, which is included in Option 2, but does provide a frontage road on the north side of I-69 from Daviess County Road 350 North to Daviess County Road 350 East. The frontage road would allow access to the south via CR 250 E, thus avoiding the potential mining traffic on CR 350 E.

CR 350 North (Daviess County)	Description of Proposed Access	Cost <u>Savings</u> or <u>Increase</u> Compared to Option 1
Option 1	Overpass will be constructed at CR 350 East. CR 350 North will be closed (Tier 1 proposed access).	-
Option 2	Overpasses will be constructed at CR 350 North and 350 East.	\$1,470,000 more
Option 3	Overpass will be constructed at CR 350 East. CR 350 North will be closed and a frontage road would be constructed along the northern I-69 R/W from CR 350 North to CR 350 East.	\$940,000 more

NOTE: Option 1 is the access as presented in the Tier 1 Study. The cost for that access option is the baseline cost. Other options may cost more or less than Option 1.

- ii. Daviess County Road 750N, 800N and 900N (Attachment D) – the Tier 1 Study included overpasses at Daviess County Road 750 North and Daviess County Road 800 North. Daviess County Road 900 North was closed. Amish are located east of the I-69 alignment north to Daviess County Road 900 East. Amish are located within the Town of Epsom, which is located east of the I-69 corridor. Amish are located on the west side of the I-69 alignment from Daviess County Road 800 North to the south.
1. Option 1 – follows the recommendations from the Tier 1 Study which included overpasses at Daviess County Roads 750 and 800 North. Daviess County Road 900 North would be closed.
  2. Option 2 - An overpass was added at Daviess County Road 900 North, at the request of a CAC member, to provide better access to the Town of Epsom. Epsom lies south of the intersection of Daviess County Road 900 North and Daviess County Road 550 East. Access along Daviess County Road 900 North would include commercial traffic from Epsom. Overpasses would also be included at Daviess County Roads 750 North and 800 North.
  3. Option 3 – eliminate the overpass at Daviess County Road 750 North but provide a frontage road along the southern right-of-way of I-69 from Daviess County Road 450 East and Daviess County Road 750 North. Amish farmsteads are located on both sides of the I-69 alignment at this location. Perpetuating access between the Amish farmsteads would be important to the Amish community. Overpasses would be located at Daviess County Roads 800 North and 900 North.
  4. Option 4 – provide an overpass at Daviess County Road 750 North. The overpass would be built to support lighter (Amish traffic) loads. Amish farmsteads are located immediately on both sides of the I-69 alignment at this location. Perpetuating access between the Amish farmsteads would be important to the Amish community. Overpasses, constructed to meet INDOT legal load limits would be built at Daviess County Roads 800 North and 900 North.

CR 750N to CR 900N (Daviess County)	Description of Proposed Access	Cost <u>Savings</u> or <u>Increase</u> Compared to Option 1
Option 1	Overpasses at CR 750N and 800N. CR 900N would be closed. (Tier 1 proposed access)	-
Option 2	Overpasses at CR 750N, 800N and 900N.	\$1,300,000 more
Option 3	Overpasses at CR 800N and 900N. No overpass at CR 750N but a frontage road would be constructed located south of the I-69 R/W from CR 450E to CR 750N.	\$1,050,000 more

CR 750N to CR 900N (Daviness County) cont.	Description of Proposed Access	Cost <u>Savings</u> or <u>Increase</u> Compared to Option 1
Option 4	Overpasses at CR 800N and CR 900N. These overpasses would be constructed to INDOT standard (80,000# load). An overpass would be constructed at CR 750N which would have a load limit that is much less than the legal load. The overpass would be restricted to light vehicles and non-motorized vehicles.	\$300,000 more
NOTE: Option 1 is the access as presented in the Tier 1 Study. The cost for that access option is the baseline cost. Other options may cost more or less than Option 1.		

- iii. Daviness County Road 1400 North (Attachment E) – the Tier 1 Study included an interchange at SR 58 and overpasses at Daviness County Roads 1400 North and 1500 North.
- Option 1 – follows the recommendations from the Tier 1 Study which included an interchange at SR 58 and overpasses at Daviness County Roads 1400 N and 1500 N.
  - Option 2 – Provide an interchange at SR 58 and an overpass at Daviness County Road 1500 N. Daviness County Road 1400 N would be closed.

SR 58 to CR 1500N (Daviness County)	Description of Proposed Access	Cost <u>Savings</u> or <u>Increase</u> Compared to Option 1
Option 1	Interchange at SR 58 and overpasses at CR 1400N and CR 1500N (Tier 1 proposed access).	-
Option 2	Interchange at SR 58 and an overpass at CR 1500N. CR 1400N would be closed.	\$2,000,000 less
NOTE: Option 1 is the access as presented in the Tier 1 Study. The cost for that access option is the baseline cost. Other options may cost more or less than Option 1.		

Attached are graphics that show the overpass options that will be presented to the public. The selection of access at these locations will be made in the FEIS and will be based on public and local agency input, resource agency input, but also input from FHWA and INDOT.

If there are any questions about this information, please contact David Pluckebaum at 488-2363.