

**US 50 North Vernon Project
Environmental Assessment
Comment-Response Matrix
December 15, 2011**

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
S1	Joe	S1-1	Traffic Safety	There was a recent accident on SR 3 and there were letters to the editor about trucks pulling out onto SR 3. Concerned that the proposed non-signalized intersection where the bypass meets SR 3 will generate similar safety concerns.	INDOT evaluated the need for a signal at the proposed intersection of the new roadway and SR 3. Based on projected traffic volumes, it did not meet signal warrant criteria. INDOT understands that this need may change over time and could be altered if a full bypass around North Vernon is completed in the future. To this end, construction of this intersection will include the installation of conduit to accommodate a signalized intersection in the future. As INDOT moves forward with the planning study for the eastern half of the bypass (study to begin Spring 2012), the traffic operations of this intersection will be re-evaluated.
		S1-2	Access	How much does it cost to add intersections and how much does it add or subtract from safety?	The cost to add an intersection is highly variable depending on the location and design. Typical costs would be in the range of \$250,000 to \$500,000. At the localized level, intersections are inherently less safe than a roadway with no intersections.
S2	Richard Morin	S2-1	Traffic	"I see several deficiencies in what's been presented. I don't believe that the traffic flow has really been accounted for properly...not only the non-signalized intersection at SR 3, but also the non-signalized intersection at US 50 which I think is going to be a bigger issue." There is still going to be a lot of traffic on old US 50 and that will be an accident waiting to happen without a signal.	INDOT evaluated the need for a signal at the proposed intersections of the new roadway and SR 3 (northern terminus) and existing US 50 (southern terminus). Based on projected traffic volumes, neither met signal warrant criteria. INDOT understands that this need may change over time and could be altered if a full bypass around North Vernon is completed in the future. To this end, construction of both intersections will include the installation of conduit to accommodate a signalized intersection in the future. As INDOT moves forward with the planning study for the eastern half of the bypass (study to begin Spring 2012), the traffic operations of these intersections will be re-evaluated.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		S2-2	Traffic	The closing of CR 300 N, which is heavily traveled by traffic cutting from SR 3 to SR 7, will put that traffic somewhere else.	INDOT has completed a travel demand model for the area to project future traffic volumes on the local street network, including SR 3, SR 7, and CR 300 N and does not anticipate substantial congestion or safety concerns in this area. However, INDOT will continue to monitor conditions in the area and will address any issues in the future.
		S2-3	Traffic	The new roadway will increase traffic on CR 200 N. There's no improvements scheduled for that road.	Original plans for the new roadway did not include access points at either O&M Avenue/CR 150 N or CR 200 N. The Project Team consulted both the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) and the general public (via a public open house) regarding the number and location of access points to the new roadway. The consensus of these consultations was that it was desirable to include full access at both O&M Avenue/CR 150 N and CR 200 N in order to both limit circuitous routing for local residents and to facilitate the movement of emergency service vehicles (police, fire, ambulance). Understanding the concern regarding increased vehicular traffic on CR 200 N, INDOT will forward your concern to Jennings County and the City of North Vernon consideration of physical improvements (e.g., sidewalks, traffic calming measures, etc.) or restrictions on the size/type of vehicles permitted to use the roadway.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		S2-4	Right-of-Way	There's nothing in the information here about what the final ROW width is. The 2008 Corridor Study mentioned 300-foot rural and an urban section. Now, they are indicating that they're taking 300' basically through the whole thing and they're not reducing ROW in urban area. This extra ROW will take tax base away from the County, take away developable land, increase environmental impacts. I have asked for an answer as to why this change was made but have not received an answer.	<p>The entire new roadway, including the section from CR 200 N to SR 3 is located within the unincorporated portion of Jennings County, outside the North Vernon city limits. The decision to utilize a rural 4-lane cross-section was based on maintaining continuity within the corridor and cost.</p> <p>The 2008 Preliminary Alternatives Screening Report was conceptual in nature and did not consider existing topography in the development of the roadway profile and cross-section.</p> <p>INDOT conducted a cost comparison of a 4-lane urban roadway (~200 foot right-of-way) and a 4-lane rural roadway (300 foot right-of-way). (Due to the limited access nature of the roadway, even the "urban" section would be 4 lanes, not five.) That analysis indicated that the urban roadway would be substantially more expensive than the rural one, due to the cost of barriers, drainage systems, and retaining walls required. Constructing the roadway within a 110-foot right-of-way would require even larger retaining walls through much of the corridor, increasing the marginal cost by several times.</p> <p>The difference in right-of-way required between the rural and urban roadways is approximately 30 acres. The cost of this right-of-way does not approach the added cost of the urban roadway and, given the availability of undeveloped land in the area, INDOT does not believe that this will constrain potential development.</p>
		S2-5	Project Support	I am pro bypass. A full bypass will reduce some traffic in some areas, but it needs to be done right and that's my concern.	Comment noted.
S3	Lorene Otting	S3-1	Property Damage	The geotechnical survey for the project resulted in \$10,000 worth of damage to corn crop.	INDOT has a process to handle damages to property resulting from such activities. That process is underway.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		S3-2	Right-of-Way	I received an offer of \$3,250 per acre for 83.326 acres of property to be acquired for the project. The comparable prices for replacement land that I have identified are "more than double" the offer from INDOT.	The appraisal process is based on recent comparable sales in the area. INDOT is following all required processes regarding right-of-way acquisition. That process includes opportunities to provide additional comparable-sales data and to appeal the offer provided. Information regarding this process is provided to each property owner from whom right-of-way is to be acquired.
S4	Keith Stearns, Stearns Supply Center	S4-1	Traffic	Our business is going to be about 700' south of the intersection at SR 7. I don't think enough consideration has been given to the traffic load and problems that will be created at our business. The stop light at the bypass and SR 7 will cause cars to back up past their entrance and there will continually be cars in front of our driveway. If you want to leave and go south on SR 7, that could be just about impossible.	The queuing analysis for the proposed intersection of the new roadway and SR 7 indicates that maximum queue lengths will be far short of this driveway.
		S4-2	Project Scope	He wonders if the design wasn't compromised because of budget cut-backs, making the project shorter and shorter.	INDOT will initiate a study in Spring 2012 to consider completion of a full bypass for US 50 around North Vernon.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		S4-3	Project Support, Business Impact	"I'm 100% in favor of the bypass. I just want to know ...if anyone can tell me what the impact will be presently to my business ..."	Access will be maintained to the property and the entrance drive will be reconstructed.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
S5	Gloria Robbins	S5-1	Traffic	The school corporation has a clinic (on SR 7, south of the new roadway). With Stearns, the radio station, my real estate office, and now the clinic located just south of the new roadway, I'm concerned about traffic operations and access. INDOT should consider constructing a frontage road connecting these properties and JacC's Food Store to pull some of the traffic off SR 7.	<p>The clinic is located approximately 1/3 mile south of the proposed intersection of the new roadway and SR 7. INDOT has completed a travel demand model for the area to project future traffic volumes on the local street network, including SR 3, SR 7, and CR 300 N and does not anticipate substantial congestion or safety concerns in this area. However, INDOT will continue to monitor conditions in the area and will address any issues in the future.</p> <p>The need for, and construction of, an access road as proposed is a local issue and will be forwarded to the City of North Vernon for their consideration.</p> <p>The clinic is not intended to handle large volumes of customers on a daily basis. Traffic control for any large, special events drawing large numbers should be discussed with the City of North Vernon Police Department.</p>
S6	Dave Snellenberger	S6-1	Traffic	Keith Stearns has a good point. I work for the phone company and while doing work on SR 7 about ¾ miles from Keith's business, we had one way flagged traffic, which caused traffic to back up for 2.5 miles. If you've got a stoplight within 500' of his place, he will never get anyone in or out of that place.	The queuing analysis for the proposed intersection of the new roadway and SR 7 indicates that maximum queue lengths will be far short of this driveway.
		S6-2	Safety	Trucks at Lowes pull out in front of traffic on SR 3. The intersection at SR 3 will just be another place where trucks will pull out in front of traffic and cause accidents.	INDOT evaluated the need for a signal at the proposed intersection of the new roadway and SR 3. Based on projected traffic volumes, it did not meet signal warrant criteria. INDOT understands that this need may change over time and could be altered if a full bypass around North Vernon is completed in the future. To this end, construction of this intersection will include the installation of conduit to accommodate a signalized intersection in the future. As INDOT moves forward with the planning study for the eastern half of the bypass (study to begin Spring 2012), the traffic operations of this intersection will be re-evaluated.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
S7	Mike Clancy	S7-1	Traffic	I have an equipment rental business between where Richard Morin is buying a building (2700 N. SR 7) and Keith Stearns (Stearns Supply Center), so I'm just echoing their concern that traffic is already an issue. It's difficult to get in and out and this is just going to add to that congestion.	INDOT has had follow-up conversations with this property owner and understands the concerns. Access to these properties will continue to be evaluated during the final design process. INDOT is evaluating a raised median on SR 7 to address safety concerns and will be discussing modifications to access with each property owner.
F1	Roger Trimpe	F1-1	Access	If CR 300 N floods, he will not be able to get to Hwy 7 (and CR 300 N will be closed at the bypass if he tries to go the other way on 300 N)	Based on preliminary information provided, INDOT understands that the Unnamed Tributary of Sixmile Creek crossing at CR 300 N periodically overflows its banks following rain events. INDOT further understands that in limited instances (i.e. a few days a year) the overflow of the Creek has temporarily flooded the area where the remaining point of access for the property is situated. Current design of the new roadway will eliminate access to the Trimpe property to State Road 3 via County Road 300 on the East side of the property, which is currently under development for residential use. During the right-of-way acquisition process, INDOT will evaluate the impact its proposed acquisition and the project itself has on the Trimpe property including, but not limited to, whether the access remaining after the acquisition and completion of the project is reasonable, and INDOT will compensate the property owner for any damages compensable under Indiana law.
		F1-2	Traffic	Concerned with vehicles being able to make the left turn from WB CR 300 N onto SB SR7.	With the conversion of CR 300 N to a "No Outlet" street, the volumes turning out of CR 300 N on to SR 7 will be minimal. This intersection has been reconstructed in recent years and meets current design standards for safety. Accident history at this intersection indicates that there is not an existing safety problem. It does not meet warrant criteria for a signal. Therefore, no modifications are planned for this intersection.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
F2	William Morin	F2-1	Right-of-Way	A portion of the property owner's driveway will be within the right-of-way and will be reconstructed. Who is responsible for maintaining it?	The driveway at this location (3535 W. US 50) will be reconstructed in-kind or better. The property owner will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the new drive.
		F2-2	Utilities	Will utilities stay within the right-of-way near my property (3535 W. US 50)?	Yes.
F3	Becky Curlin	F3-1	Project support	This project/alternative makes a lot of sense. Seems to be the best and easiest way.	Comment noted.
E1	Wayne Stearns, Stearns Supply Center	E1-1	Access	There is often a long wait for vehicles leaving the business (located at 2550 N. SR 7) trying to go south on SR 7. The present driveway is 36' wide. Would you consider making it 20' wider? This would allow for two exit lanes (both a left and right turn lane) and an incoming lane. Drive needs to accommodate vehicles with trailers.	A standard commercial drive, which provides for two exit and one entry lane, will be constructed at this location.
		E1-2	Access	He also mentions that a deceleration/turn lane for his business, south of the drive (for north bound customers) might help.	A deceleration lane is not warranted at this location based on volumes and cost.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
E2	Joseph Kipper	E2-1	Traffic	The bypass intersection with CR 200 N is a bad idea. CR 200 N will be a short cut for big trucks and autos to and from the SR 3 & SR 7 intersection. CR 200 N has a large amount of foot traffic at Hickory Manor and Brookside Estates, but has no sidewalks and has poor lighting. Approx 100 school aged children live in these two subdivisions. Omitting the proposed intersection at CR 200 N would be less costly and would discourage the big trucks from using this route.	Original plans for the new roadway did not include access points at either O&M Avenue/CR 150 N or CR 200 N. The Project Team consulted both the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) and the general public (via a public open house) regarding the number and location of access points to the new roadway. The consensus of these consultations was that it was desirable to include full access at both O&M Avenue/CR 150 N and CR 200 N in order to both limit circuitous routing for local residents and to facilitate the movement of emergency service vehicles (police, fire, ambulance). Understanding the concern regarding increased vehicular traffic on CR 200 N, INDOT will forward your concern to Jennings County and the City of North Vernon consideration of physical improvements (e.g., sidewalks, traffic calming measures, etc.) or restrictions on the size/type of vehicles permitted to use the roadway.
E3	Mike Clancy, Clancy Tool Rental	E-3	Access	I have concerns regarding ingress and egress of the three properties on the southeast corner of the state road 7 / 50 bypass intersection and the resulting negative effect on our businesses. At times, it is very difficult to exit our properties with the existing lane configuration. I fear that during heavy traffic flow it will difficult to turn north due to the traffic light backup and nearly impossible to turn left across three lanes toward town. I would like INDOT to consider moving the drive access location further south, away from the proposed intersection.	INDOT has had follow-up conversations with this property owner and understands the concerns. Access to these properties will continue to be evaluated during the final design process. INDOT is evaluating a raised median on SR 7 to address safety concerns and will be discussing modifications to access with each property owner.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
E4	Michael and Mona Huckelberry	E4-1	Alternatives Evaluation	The northern section is running through the middle of our family property and causing us to have to relocate. I do not understand why that the highway cannot be routed around us when there is nothing but open farm land to the west and north of us. It seems that it would be less expense to purchase land than homes.	The alignment was designed to meet transportation goals, safety standards and to minimize impacts to environmental and community resources. Alternative N6 considered an alignment similar to the one suggested. However, INDOT determined that the proximity of the new intersection to the existing one at SR 3 and CR 350 N would not allow for safe operational conditions. Therefore, it was shifted south to provide adequate separation; this change is reflected in Alternative N6-Modified (the preferred alternative in this section).
		E4-2	Alternatives Evaluation	If the proposed intersection at SR 3 was moved back to the north approximately 150-200 ft. it looks like one residential relocation could be eliminated. Our family owns the lot north of my mother's house which has 150 ft. of road frontage. The next residence north of our lot has 150 ft. of road frontage. Those two lots results in the 300 ft. of ROW needed for the project. This also places the highway north of me in the field and could be routed around behind our home further to the west. This would result in only one residential relocation rather than two.	Shifting the alignment to the north could potentially reduce residential impacts by one residence as suggested. However, this would also result in an alignment directly across from Lord of Life Lutheran Church. While INDOT has yet to develop alternatives for the eastern half of a possible full bypass of North Vernon, it is anticipated that one set of options will include the extension of the current project directly to the east. The proposed terminus location was chosen, in part, to accommodate this option in the future.
		E4-3	Meeting Request	I would invite you and any other persons that need to be involved, to set up a meeting here on our property to look at the possibility of reconsidering the final end of this bypass project.	INDOT has identified an alignment that balances the project's purpose and need with the goal of minimizing social, economic, and environmental impact. INDOT has met with this property owner at the site previously to discuss potential alignments and measures to minimize impact to their property. INDOT will set up a meeting with this and other nearby property owners (see Comment E5) to discuss their concerns and suggestions.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
E5	Jeff O'Connor	E5-1	Alternatives Evaluation	Recommend shifting northern terminus to the north 150-300 feet to reduce impacts to residences.	INDOT has identified an alignment that balances the project's purpose and need with the goal of minimizing social, economic, and environmental impact. Shifting the alignment to the north could potentially reduce residential impacts by one residence as suggested. However, this would also result in an alignment directly across from Lord of Life Lutheran Church. While INDOT has yet to develop alternatives for the eastern half of a possible full bypass of North Vernon, it is anticipated that one set of options will include the extension of the current project directly to the east. The proposed terminus location was chosen, in part, to accommodate this option in the future.
		E5-2	Meeting Request	Request on-site meeting with Project Team and adjacent property owners to discuss alternative options for the northern terminus.	INDOT will set up a meeting with this and other nearby property owners to discuss their concerns and suggestions.
E6	Richard Morin	E6-1	Project Support	I am in favor of a bypass as I believe that a bypass could be a worthwhile improvement for the community.	Comment noted.
		E6-2	Alternatives Evaluation	The 2008 Corridor Study indicated that the proposed bypass would utilize a 5-lane - "urban" cross-section that could typically be fit within a 110-foot right-of-way. While the current project is only constructing two lanes, the proposed right-of-way acquisition is based on a 4-lane "rural" cross-section, requiring a 300-foot right-of-way. This change was made internally at INDOT and without consultation with the public. This change affects many aspects of the project including: acquisition costs, potential relocations, the total county property tax reductions, potential future developments, design speed, and environmental impacts. The project should utilize an "urban" cross section because:	The entire new roadway, including the section from CR 200 N to SR 3 is located within the unincorporated portion of Jennings County, outside the North Vernon city limits. The decision to utilize a rural 4-lane cross-section was based on maintaining continuity within the corridor and cost. The 2008 Preliminary Alternatives Screening Report was conceptual in nature and did not consider existing topography in the development of the roadway profile and cross-section INDOT conducted a cost comparison of a 4-lane urban roadway (~200 foot right-of-way) and a 4-lane rural roadway (300 foot right-of-way). (Due to the limited access nature of the roadway, even the "urban" section would be 4 lanes, not five.) That analysis indicated that the urban roadway would be substantially more expensive than the rural one, due to the cost of barriers, drainage systems, and retaining walls

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The alignment lies within a designated urban boundary area. - The alignment crosses high volume roads. - The alignment passes through anticipated annexation areas. - The alignment passes through existing and planned commercial and industrial areas. - The alignment passes between high population areas. - The proposed design includes at-grade intersections. - The close proximity of traffic signals. - Anticipated high truck volumes. - Phased construction approach (only two lanes to be constructed at this time). - Conservation of private property. - Preservation of county tax base. - Preservation of the environment. - Preservation of development potential. - Potential reduction in residential relocations. <p>Further the use of a "rural" cross-section for this project implies its continued use if/when INDOT completes the North Vernon bypass, which may be inappropriate and contrary to assumptions made in the 2008 Corridor Study.</p> <p>Initial cost differences should not be the only factor in determining the appropriate cross-section. The timing of the construction of the 3rd and 4th lanes should be considered in the cost analysis. The analysis should also consider the loss of property tax revenue to local jurisdictions that will continue in perpetuity. How much</p>	<p>required. Constructing the roadway within a 110-foot right-of-way would require even larger retaining walls through much of the corridor, increasing the marginal cost by several times.</p> <p>The difference in right-of-way required between the rural and urban roadways is approximately 30 acres. The cost of this right-of-way does not approach the added cost of the urban roadway and, given the availability of undeveloped land in the area, INDOT does not believe that this will constrain potential development.</p> <p>With regards to long-range cost differences, the "rural" section has lower life-cycle costs to INDOT. Maintenance costs for the additional right-of-way is minimal that would be far exceeded by the cost to maintain the storm drains and retaining walls associated with the "urban" section.</p> <p>Finally, based on current property values and tax rates, the loss of revenue to local jurisdictions associated with the wider right-of-way is limited.</p>

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
				revenue will the local community lose and how does this compare to the construction cost differences. An "urban" cross-section would also mean less land that would need to be maintained by INDOT between now and the time the 3 rd and 4 th lanes are constructed. What would be the results of a 20, 30, or 40-year cost analysis between the "urban" and "rural" cross-sections.	
		E6-3	Alternatives Evaluation	While it considered a wide range of alignment options east of SR 7, the 2008 Corridor Study did not consider diverse alignments west of SR 7.	The 2008 Corridor Study (see page 4-13) used as a starting point, the alignment options identified in the Jennings County Thoroughfare Plan, adopted as part of the Jennings county Comprehensive Plan (November 1, 1994). The Thoroughfare Plan identified three alignments (Far North, Near North, and South) for a bypass. The 2008 Corridor Study considered these general alignments as well as several others. Specifically, within the area west of SR 7, the 2008 Corridor Study evaluated two options for Preliminary Alternative A(see page 4-23); this alternative was one of two forwarded for detailed study in the current project. Because these options had only minor differences in traffic performance and safety, an analysis of socioeconomic and environmental impacts was completed. While Option 1 had moderately lower impacts to wetlands and farmland, it required 55 more residential relocations and 2 more business relocations than Option 2. Based on that evaluation, Option 2 was incorporated into the design of Alternative A.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		E6-4	Access, Traffic	The closure of CR 300 N, an urban collector road, will re-route traffic from that uses this roadway to other nearby roadways, including: CR 350 N, SR 7 south of CR 300 N, and possibly the access drive through the Jay-C Grocery Store parking lot. The current structure of CR 350N is not suitable for increased traffic loads and the access drive through Jay C could be closed. The closure of the road will place additional traffic load onto SR 7. The higher traffic load and the proposed intersection with the bypass will add additional congestion to the already congested SR 7.	<p>INDOT evaluated the potential to provide access at each roadway crossed by the proposed project. Coordination with the project's Community Advisory Committee and the public (through open house meetings) led to the prioritization of access at O&M Avenue (CR 150 N) and CR 200 N. An intersection at CR 300 N was not identified as a priority. Further, while CR 300 N is identified in the Jennings County Comprehensive Plan as an urban collector, the plan does not identify it as a priority location for an intersection with the bypass.</p> <p>Providing a full-access intersection at CR 300 N would result in undesirable intersection spacing, with the intersection at SR 7 less than 0.5 miles away. Based on design standards, such an intersection would be restricted to right-in/right-out access only. Such access would not provide the connectivity that is desired by the commenter.</p> <p>INDOT has completed a travel demand model for the area to project future traffic volumes on the local street network, including SR 3, SR 7, and CR 300 N and does not anticipate substantial congestion or safety concerns in this area. However, INDOT will continue to monitor conditions in the area and will address any issues in the future.</p>
		E6-5	Access	If CR 300 N floods, as it occasionally does, a resident could be "landlocked" without access.	This issue will be evaluated during the right-of-way acquisition process. See response to comment F1-1 for full detail.
		E6-6	Access	Suggest the construction of an overpass for CR 300 N over the bypass to maintain connectivity.	While an evaluation of this specific location was not completed, a similar evaluation was completed for O&M Avenue (CR 150 N) during the project's development. That evaluation estimated the cost of an overpass for the county road at \$3.65 million. The cost of an overpass for CR 300 N could be expected to be in the same range and would exceed the potential benefits provided.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		E6-7	Alternatives Evaluation	Suggest utilizing an alignment that does not cross CR 300 N between SR 3 and SR 7 so that it can be maintained and possibly improved to support the growing demand for access.	INDOT has considered a range of alignments for the proposed roadway and has identified an alignment that best balances the project's purpose and need with the goal of minimizing social, economic, and environmental impact.
		E6-8	Traffic	Concerned about the impact of the bypass on traffic operations on SR 7. What is the expected Level of Service (LOS) on SR 7 due to the proposed bypass? Due to the above considerations, will it be LOS D or higher immediately upon completion of the project? With the project creating these impacts, shouldn't the project also mitigate the higher traffic load issues to intersecting roads?	Based on INDOT forecasting of regional travel demand patterns in 2030 (accounting for anticipated growth in the area), traffic volumes on SR 7 immediately south of the proposed intersection location will increase by 6 percent as a result of the project. This segment of SR 7 is expected to operate at LOS D in both the No Build (without the project) and Build (with the project) conditions.
		E6-9	Traffic, Alternatives Evaluation	The project should consider improvements to SR 7 such as widening to 4 or 5 lanes or the addition of frontage roads for access to businesses.	Based on INDOT forecasting of regional travel demand patterns in 2030 (accounting for anticipated growth in the area), SR 7 in the vicinity of the new roadway is expected to operate at LOS D in both the No Build (without the project) and Build (with the project) conditions; therefore, INDOT is not investigating widening of the roadway at this time. INDOT has had several conversations with business owners in the area and understands their access concerns. Access to these properties will continue to be evaluated during the final design process and INDOT will be discussing modifications to access with each property owner.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		E6-10	Traffic, Safety	Suggest that the proposed intersections with existing US 50 and SR 3 be signalized to provide safe and efficient access.	INDOT evaluated the need for a signal at the proposed intersections of the new roadway and SR 3 (northern terminus) and existing US 50 (southern terminus). Based on projected traffic volumes, neither met signal warrant criteria. INDOT understands that this need may change over time and could be altered if a full bypass around North Vernon is completed in the future. To this end, construction of both intersections will include the installation of conduit to accommodate a signalized intersection in the future. As INDOT moves forward with the planning study for the eastern half of the bypass (study to begin Spring 2012), the traffic operations of these intersections will be re-evaluated.
		E6-11	Traffic, Business Impact	Concerned that the proposed signalized intersection at SR 7 will create congestion and access issues that will discourage customers from patronizing businesses in the area.	INDOT has had several conversations with property owners in the area and understands the concerns. Access to these properties will continue to be evaluated during the final design process. INDOT is evaluating a raised median on SR 7 to address safety concerns and will be discussing modifications to access with each property owner.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		E6-12	Traffic	The installation of intersections on CR 150N and CR 200N will impact the county roads and city streets. It should affect CR 200N more than CR 150N as CR 200N provides a convenient path and proximity between the bypass and the hospital, banks, retail, and restaurants. CR 200N is also a collector road and should not be closed. The increased traffic along CR 200N will tend to create additional commercial developments in the area. It is noted that these intersection lie within the urban boundary as shown on the INDOT Urban Boundary map for the City of North Vernon. CR 200N is not designed for a high traffic load and improvements are needed due to the anticipated higher traffic load.	Original plans for the new roadway did not include access points at either O&M Avenue/CR 150 N or CR 200 N. The Project Team consulted both the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) and the general public (via a public open house) regarding the number and location of access points to the new roadway. The consensus of these consultations was that it was desirable to include full access at both O&M Avenue/CR 150 N and CR 200 N in order to both limit circuitous routing for local residents and to facilitate the movement of emergency service vehicles (police, fire, ambulance). Understanding the concern regarding increased vehicular traffic on CR 200 N, INDOT will forward your concern to Jennings County and the City of North Vernon consideration of physical improvements (e.g., sidewalks, traffic calming measures, etc.) or restrictions on the size/type of vehicles permitted to use the roadway.
		E6-13	Access, Traffic	Concerned that the proposed signalized intersection at SR 7 will generate backups sufficient to block access to the business drive at 2700 N. SR 7 creating an access/egress issue. What considerations are being made to create a safe design in the area of the US 50 and SR 7 intersection? What is the appropriate intersection design? Is the traffic load sufficient to require the construction of an interchange? Should a frontage road be created for the businesses to allow better ingress/egress and create a safer design? Should SR 7 be four lanes from a point north of the bypass to SR 3? How many customers will avoid the businesses due to the increased difficulty in ingress/egress? Will businesses fail due to the bypass location and design?	INDOT has had several conversations with property owners in the area and understands the concerns. Access to these properties will continue to be evaluated during the final design process. INDOT is evaluating a raised median on SR 7 to address safety concerns and will be discussing modifications to access with each property owner.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		E6-14	Right-of-Way, Alternatives Evaluation	<p>Since property has been acquired for the alignment and right of way width as presented at the public hearing, will this have an influence on a proper decision? What safeguards are in place to insure that decisions are not based upon the protection of already incurred costs, whether the costs are from environmental, design or other studies or the acquisition of property that may not be needed or from design, etc. that needs to be redone?</p>	<p>In response to a request from INDOT, FHWA granted INDOT authority to acquire right-of-way for the project using state funds prior to completion of the NEPA process. As described in FHWA's memo (provided in Appendix K of the Environmental Assessment) this authority includes conditions prohibiting the early acquisition of right-of-way from factoring into alignment decisions:</p> <p>"[The] decision on the specific alignment of the highway and its related design elements such as frontage roads and access roads will not be affected by the early acquisition of these properties. State ownership of property will not be used to "pre-determine" the location of the highway."</p>

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
E7	David Otting	E7-1	Alternatives Evaluation	Suggest an alternate alignment (provided on attached map) in the southern section in an effort to reduce impacts to farmland and tie-in better to existing US 50.	<p>INDOT's design team has reviewed the proposed alignment and identified the following issues when compared to Alternative S2-Modified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The total length of roadway would be increased by several thousand feet, increasing construction costs. - The alignment would require the Base Road bridge to be raised. This would require the use of extensive retaining walls, which are expensive, to maintain, if possible, access to the properties on CR 400 W located west of the railroad. If access can't be maintained, the property would need to be acquired. - The Base Road bridge would be constructed at a greater skew to the railroad, increasing the costs of the bridge. - The alignment would have the following effect on the project's impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Two additional residences would be relocated (at minimum) o Stream impact would increase by 2,852 linear feet o Wetland impact would decrease by 0.44 acres. o Right-of-way impacts would increase by a minimum of 33 acres. o Forest impact would increase. <p>Based on this evaluation, INDOT feels that Alternative S2-Modified better meets the project's goals.</p>

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
E8	Bernard Hauersperger	E8-1	Traffic	While the August 15, 2011 Field Check Plans indicated a traffic signal at the proposed intersection of existing US 50 and the new roadway, the Environmental Assessment indicates that this will be a stop-controlled intersection. This intersection with old and new US 50 will remain as one of the most critical intersections in our county along with the SR 7 Signal. We want to strongly recommend that a Traffic Signal for 4-Way Stop or a redesign for a roundabout be provided at this intersection.	INDOT evaluated the need for a signal at the proposed intersection of the new roadway and existing US 50. Based on projected traffic volumes, neither met signal warrant criteria. INDOT understands that this need may change over time and could be altered if a full bypass around North Vernon is completed in the future. To this end, construction of both intersections will include the installation of conduit to accommodate a signalized intersection in the future. As INDOT moves forward with the planning study for the eastern half of the bypass (study to begin Spring 2012), the traffic operations of these intersections will be re-evaluated.
E9	Rodney Ochs, Lowes	E9-1	Safety	Lowes is concerned that the number of trucks coming from the new roadway, south on SR 3, and turning left onto JFK Drive will create a safety hazard. There have been several accidents at this location already.	INDOT understands the concerns regarding access to the Lowes facility and will be reviewing the need for improvements in the near future.
E10	Howard Malcomb	E10-1	Alternatives Evaluation	It seems strange to build two bridges at the connection of US 50 when you could connect on the North side of the track.	The S2-Modified alignment crosses the railroad at a location approximately 0.5 miles from the nearest point of CR 400 W, requiring a long connection through wooded terrain. Additionally, adding an intersection at this location would likely require realignment of the new roadway in order to meet safety standards for intersections.
E11	muttlapdog@earthlink[dot]net	E11-1	Information Request	Where can one view the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)?	The current version (2009) is available on the internet at: http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/pdfs/2009/pdf_index.htm
		E11-2	Spot Improvement Project	Many of the proposed spot improvements along existing US 50 propose "passing blister", which allow through traffic to utilize the "blister" when a vehicle is stopped in the travel lane waiting to turn left. I propose the use of an "aneurysm lane", which would provide a continuous lane for through traffic so they always use the same lane. Turning traffic would use a dedicated turn lane.	The new roadway portion of the project does not include the use of passing blisters. The intersection improvements to existing US 50 are being documented through a separate evaluation. The comment will be addressed as part of that project.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		E11-3	Spot Improvement Project	Concerned about the impact of closing existing US 50 and the length of detours when the three bridges (at Mutton Creek, Storm Creek, and Branch of Storm Creek) are replaced.	Replacement of the three bridges on existing US 50 is being addressed through a separate environmental document. The comment will be addressed as part of that project. [Note: the current proposal for the replacement of these three bridges will provide one lane of traffic throughout most of construction.]
		E11-4	Traffic	Despite what the guidelines and warrant study indicate, the project should include signalized intersections at both existing US 50 and SR 3. Commonsense is of greater value than engineering standards.	INDOT evaluated the need for a signal at the proposed intersections of the new roadway and SR 3 (northern terminus) and existing US 50 (southern terminus). Based on projected traffic volumes, neither met signal warrant criteria. INDOT understands that this need may change over time and could be altered if a full bypass around North Vernon is completed in the future. To this end, construction of both intersections will include the installation of conduit to accommodate a signalized intersection in the future. As INDOT moves forward with the planning study for the eastern half of the bypass (study to begin Spring 2012), the traffic operations of these intersections will be re-evaluated.
		E11-5	Traffic	Why weren't passing lanes included on the new roadway? This will create safety concerns agricultural equipment uses the new roadway.	An evaluation of the proposed alignment indicated that grades were not sufficient to warrant climbing lanes. The new roadway will include 10-foot paved shoulders on each side that could be used to facilitate passing of farm equipment.
		E11-6	Information Request	Does the Indiana Code still outlaw agricultural equipment on roads where the speed limit exceeds 35 mph?	There is no direct prohibition of agricultural vehicles based on speed limit. Requirements are based on highway type and vehicle type. See Indiana Code (IC) 9-21-9 and Indiana Administrative Code (IAC) Title 105, Article 9 for details.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		E11-7	Signage	<p>Is a better job going to be done in regards to signs giving advanced notice to motorist than what is customary in this state?</p> <p>Specifically, many notices are only given with signs and arrows painted on the ground at or near intersections. This might work for someone who is very familiar with the location but it is a hazard for the less frequent traveler. Considering the speeds that are to be expected on the bypass, not only are signs needed at and near the intersection, but some advance notice needs to be given with signs possibly 400 feet (5 seconds of traveling time) before the intersection.</p>	<p>Proposed signage and pavement markings are in accordance with the most current Indiana Design Manual and Indiana Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and include a combination of roadside signs and in-lane pavement markings. No overhead signs are proposed for this project.</p>
		E11-8	Traffic	<p>Will the center line be marked for not passing as a car approaches an intersection as opposed to Hwy 50 at 300 W in Ripley County where is marked to legally pass up to the intersection, but not afterwards?</p>	<p>Proposed pavement markings are in accordance with the most current Indiana Design Manual and Indiana Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. No passing zones will be designed where they are warranted according to these manuals. All intersections on the new bypass have left turn lanes which would prohibit passing well before and after intersections.</p>
E12	James A. Glass, Ph.D., IDNR-DHPA	E12-1	Construction Impacts	<p>A more complete description of FHWA's and INDOT's obligations described in commitment #19 would be: "If any archaeological artifacts or human remains are uncovered during construction, demolition, or earthmoving activities, state law (Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and -29) requires that the discovery be reported to the Department of Natural Resources within two (2) business days. In that event, please call (317) 232-1646. Be advised that adherence to Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and -29 does not obviate the need to adhere to applicable federal statutes and regulations."</p>	<p>The text of the commitment has been updated as recommended.</p>

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
E13	Jeff Gee and Mark Echard, Metaldyne	E13-1	Safety	Metaldyne is concerned about their northern drive and the safety of having their employees use the dedicated right turn lane (designed for the bypass) for their drive also. They feel semi trucks would not slow down soon enough and rear end vehicles.	Project team members have met with representatives of Metaldyne to review the issues. Signage, indicating the entrance, and a wider shoulder will be provided in the area to address the issue.
M1	John J and Marsha A. White	M1-1	Traffic, Safety	Because the Bypass is incomplete by virtue of its termination at SR 3, the bulk of traffic (65-70%) will stay on what is now US 50. But now free flow of traffic will be disturbed by the new intersection shown as "CR400W connector/US50" in the published material. This looks like it will be a dangerous and congested intersection even if the Bypass is ever completed since it will always carry school and downtown North Vernon traffic. Good bypass design includes ramps and overpasses, not grade level crossings.	INDOT has completed a travel demand model for the area to project future traffic volumes on the study area roadway network including projections regarding use of existing US 50 and the new roadway. That analysis estimates that 44% of future traffic (all vehicles) and 50% of trucks will use the bypass. That analysis also considered the effect of completion of a full bypass; if constructed, it is projected to attract 56% of all vehicles and 65% of trucks. The intersection will be designed to meet all design and safety standards and is projected to operate at a Level of Service B (on a scale of A through F, with A being the best) during both the AM and PM peak periods. The Level of Service and traffic volumes at the intersection do not warrant construction of an interchange.
		M1-2	Property Impact	The route chosen seems to maximize the negative impact on personal and residential property and valuable active farmland. Over half of the residential relocations and about 80% of the farmland deactivation lie in the "S2 Modified" design.	S2-Modified impacts 6 residences (out of 11 in the entire corridor) and 61 acres of farmland (out of 255 in the entire corridor). This is comparable to Alternative S1, which would require 5 residential relocations and 59 acres of farmland impact. Other alignments considered in the southern section (Alternatives S3 and S4), required fewer residential relocations, but greater impacts to farmland; they also did not satisfy the project's purpose and need as well as Alternatives S1 and S2-Modified.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		M1-3	Construction Impacts	S2 Modified" calls for two approximately 30 foot high bridges over the railroad. Including approaches, these bridges will each be about a quarter-mile long. This will require an enormous amount of fill so it's a double hit on the area – big piles of dirt resulting in big holes in the ground.	The design has been developed to balance fill material across the project. No "large holes" will be created during construction.
		M1-4	Right-of-Way	All of the residences lost and the farmland deactivated are/were owned by elderly and/or ill and/or folks with limited resources who simply can't protect themselves from projects like this. No-one can argue that they will be compensated for the intrinsic value of their property since even true market value compensation appears at risk. There is some risk that other property in the area will suffer loss in value because of traffic and access issues.	All right-of-way acquisition and relocation is being conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970.
		M1-5	Alternatives Evaluation	Most of these issues could have been avoided if the western end of the US 50 Bypass were to begin near CR450 where there is plenty of space for ramps and overpasses, where there are no homes, and where the railroad lies well below grade level thus simplifying bridge building.	Alternatives S3 and S4 both began and crossed the railroad in the area of CR 450 W (or further west). Alternative S3 was eliminated from consideration because it did not allow the new roadway to be the through movement. Traffic connecting to and from the new roadway would be forced to make a turn at a new signalized intersection. This design characteristic was in conflict with INDOT's plan to make the new roadway a complete, uninterrupted bypass of North Vernon in the future. Alternative S4 was eliminated from consideration because it had the greatest stream, open water, and wetland impacts and required the most right-of-way.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		M1-6	Drainage	Grading and paving will change all the drainage south/southeast of the "S2 Modified" area. This is the head of the Muscatatuck Watershed and will impact property, farmlands, and ponds in the drainage area. What is the plan to prevent flooding, fouling, damage, and contamination to the properties and waterways at risk?	All hydrology and hydraulics calculations were completed according to INDOT's guidelines and Indiana Design Manual (IDM) Chapters 28-31. Efforts were made to maintain existing drainage patterns and very limited changes are proposed to watershed areas. The proposed project will increase stormwater flows slightly due to the increase in impervious surface, but will have minimal downstream effects. Scour protection and riprap aprons are included in the design to minimize downstream velocity concerns. All new structures were sized based on hydraulic analysis and meet IDM backwater requirements.
		M1-7	Noise, Air Quality	What can be done to control noise and vehicle emissions resulting from the proposed intersection of the new roadway and existing US 50 by means of speed limits or noise ordinances?	Noise ordinances restricting vehicle operations, such as "engine braking" or "jake breaking" are local issues outside the jurisdiction of INDOT. The project's noise analysis evaluated the predicted that noise levels in the area around the proposed intersection would be well below the Federal Noise Abatement Criteria. A copy of the project's noise analysis can be found in Appendix G of the Environmental Assessment. This project has been determined to generate minimal air quality impacts for Clean Air Act (CAA) criteria pollutants and has not been linked with any special Mobile Source Air Toxic (MSAT) concerns. As such, this project will not result in changes in traffic volume, vehicle mix, basic project location, or any other factor that would cause an increase in MSAT impacts of the project from that of the no-build alternative.
		M1-8	Maintenance	What is the plan to maintain "old us 50" in the area and what is the land use plan for the finished project re development of the surrounding property? Are we going to be snowed-in all winter? Will the intersection area be overtaken by cheap gas stations and smelly fast food restaurants?	The section of US 50 located between CR 400 W and the realigned existing US 50 (in front of the commenters' property at 3695 W. US 50) will be owned and maintained by Jennings County. They will be responsible for maintenance, such as snow plowing, as they are today for other nearby county roads. Land use, including permitted uses, is controlled by Jennings County zoning codes and is outside the control of INDOT.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		M1-9	Property Damage	Private property was grossly abused by the Project during the study phase. Property was entered without permission. Land and infrastructure was damaged. Trees were cut and crops were ruined. General messes were created and never cleaned up. There was a generally law-less and care-less attitude towards the rights of the property owners in the area. What is the plan to protect the rights of the remaining residents of the area during the construction phase?	INDOT has a process to handle damages to property resulting from such activities. That process is underway. Construction of the project will require limited work within private property. In such areas, INDOT will acquire temporary right-of-way and compensate owners for such use. In addition, any damage caused within these areas must be fixed (in-kind or better) by the contractor. If, during construction, a property owner feels the contractor is not meeting these obligations, they should contact INDOT immediately.
		M1-10	Construction Impacts	Southern Indiana is a hotbed of illegal drug use, sales, and manufacture. We fear that once the roads and drives and buildings in the "S2 Modified" area are abandoned, the drug trade will move in and put the whole area in danger. We suggest that as the area is abandoned, all the roads and drives be barricaded and the structures demolished immediately.	INDOT intends to begin construction of the project in February 2012. Therefore, it is not anticipated that buildings or other areas will be abandoned for a significant duration. Once construction begins, site security is the responsibility of the contractor. If someone feels the contractor is not meeting these obligations, they should contact INDOT immediately. Any illegal activities should be reported immediately to local law enforcement.
M2	Scott Pruitt, USFWS	M2-1	Natural Resource Impact	Of the two alternatives considered in the Environmental Assessment for the northern section, Alternatives N3 and N6 have comparable impacts to wetlands, streams, and wildlife habitat. In the southern section, Alternative S2-Modified appears to have the least (and relatively minor) impacts on wildlife habitat. In the middle section, Alternative M2 has significantly more stream and forest impact due to its crossing of two forested drainageways. USFWS recommends Alternative M1.	Comment noted. Alternative M1 was not selected as the Preferred Alternative because it would require seven additional relocations, would require modifications to Kipper Lane to maintain access, and was not preferred by the public or CAC.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		M2-2	Natural Resource Impact	Table 3 on Page 17 provides estimates of total length of stream impacts for all alternatives carried forward from the preliminary screening (S1, S2 modified, M1, M2, N3, N6 modified). Stream impacts should be characterized in terms of the quality of the stream and the nature of impacts (e.g. minimal crossing, channel relocation, other significant channel/riparian alterations).	Information regarding the quality of streams (as per QHEI and HHEI evaluations) and impacts, in linear feet, to those streams is provided in the Wetland Delineation Report in Appendix D of the Environmental Assessment. Specific details on the nature of impact was not available at the time the EA was completed. This information will be provided in the 401/404 permit application, which USFWS will have an opportunity to review.
		M2-3	Natural Resource Impact	On pages 34-35 the draft EA analyzes indirect impacts and concludes that they will be minimal because most parcels are zoned agricultural and most properties near existing intersections are already residential lots. It is common for the presence of a new highway to stimulate rural sprawl development with re-zoning. We recommend design measures and administrative restrictions to discourage potential new connecting roads in areas of good wildlife habitat.	The new roadway will be limited access. Any additional access points will require the approval of INDOT and FHWA. Access to existing county roads is outside the jurisdiction of INDOT and FHWA.
		M2-4	Natural Resource Impact	We also recommend the following standard mitigation measures in the final project plans to minimize adverse impacts on fish and wildlife resources: 1. Post DO NOT DISTURB signs at the construction zone boundaries in forested areas, and do not clear trees or understory vegetation outside the boundaries. 2. Culverts should span the active stream channel, should be either embedded or a 3-sided or open-arch culvert, and be installed where practicable on an essentially flat slope. When an open-bottomed culvert is used in a stream with good bottom substrate for aquatic habitat (gravel, cobbles and boulders), the existing	Recommendations will be added to the project commitment list for consideration during final design and construction.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
				<p>substrate should be left undisturbed beneath the culvert.</p> <p>3. Construct bridges and culverts in wildlife habitat areas with benches and/or high water shelves for wildlife crossings.</p> <p>4. Restrict channel work, especially low-water work, and vegetation clearing to the minimum necessary for installation of bridges or culverts.</p> <p>5. Minimize the extent of artificial bank stabilization and use bioengineering methods wherever feasible. If riprap is used, extend it below low-water elevation to provide aquatic habitat.</p> <p>6. Implement temporary erosion and siltation control devices such as placement of riprap check dams in drainage ways and ditches, installation of silt fences, covering exposed areas with erosion control materials, and detention basins, in accordance with INDOT specifications.</p> <p>7. Revegetate all disturbed soil areas immediately upon project completion, using native species of plants in undeveloped areas.</p> <p>8. Avoid channel work in perennial and intermittent streams during the fish spawning season (April 1-June 30).</p>	

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		M2-5	Natural Resource Impact	The proposed project is within the range of the federally endangered Indiana bat (<i>Myotis sodalis</i>). Bat surveys were conducted in 2009 and May 2011. Based on the results of the surveys we have concluded that the project will not affect enough occupied habitat to adversely affect the Indiana bat. If tree removal is avoided in all non-surveyed summer habitat areas from April 1 through September 30, we concur that the project is not likely to adversely affect the Indiana bat.	The seasonal tree restriction will be included in the project's commitments and all construction contracts.
M3	Paul Belding	M3-1	Right-of-Way	Since all the neighboring residences will be relocated and construction will be occurring on both sides of us, we would like the state to consider buying our property as well.	The property will not be directly impacted by the project. Construction impacts will be limited in duration and the post-construction setting will be comparable to existing conditions. INDOT does not intend to expend taxpayer funds to purchase this property.
		M3-2	Drainage	We are concerned about drainage from the highway exacerbating the existing drainage problems in the area.	All hydrology and hydraulics calculations were completed according to INDOT's guidelines and Indiana Design Manual (IDM) Chapters 28-31. Efforts were made to maintain existing drainage patterns and very limited changes are proposed to watershed areas. The proposed project will increase stormwater flows slightly due to the increase in impervious surface, but will have minimal downstream effects. Scour protection and riprap aprons are included in the design to minimize downstream velocity concerns. All new structures were sized based on hydraulic analysis and meet IDM backwater requirements.
		M3-3	Right-of-Way	If our property is not acquired, we would like to potentially purchase from INDOT any excess property abutting our property.	Excess property that does not meet local requirements for minimum lot sizes is offered for sale to adjoining property owners. Please contact INDOT Real Estate for information regarding this issue.

Comment Source	Name & Organization	Comment ID#	Category	Summary of Comment	Response
		M3-4	Right-of-Way	Our neighbor told us that we could have the flagpole located on her property, which is being acquired by INDOT. Could we have it?	Information has previously been provided to the commenter regarding the appropriate contact at the INDOT Seymour District Office regarding this issue.
		M3-5	Information Request	Please let us know who wins the construction contract, as we would like to ask them about getting some fill dirt.	Information regarding the selected contractor will be public record following the bid opening. Please contact the INDOT Seymour District Office to request this information.
X1	Keith Stearns	X1-1	Traffic	<p>[Follow-up to public comments made at hearing] Our business is going to be about 700' south of the intersection at SR 7. It is our concern that your designated 4-way signalized intersection, at Highway #7, will back up traffic and block our only business driveway. This concern is for both customers trying to enter and exit the business.</p> <p>We are asking INDOT to reevaluate this traffic pattern and present to us their study results. We are not opposed to the US 50 bypass project. We're only concerned for the future of our business.</p>	The queuing analysis for the proposed intersection of the new roadway and SR 7 indicates that maximum queue lengths will be far short of this driveway.