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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Transportation Plan has been developed to update and replace the Transportation Plan contained in Chapter IV, pages 61-65, of the Harrison County Comprehensive Plan, adopted by the Harrison County Commissioners in 1996. The Comprehensive Plan discusses land use issues and offers a series of goals, objectives and policies designed to address these issues. The Transportation Plan looks at the transportation needs of the Harrison County citizens and proposes roadway improvement projects designed to meet these needs. The Harrison County Comprehensive Plan, along with the Harrison County Thoroughfare Plan, Road Construction Regulations and Subdivision Ordinance, will provide Harrison County with a blueprint for guiding growth and development in the county over the next 10 to 20 years. The Thoroughfare Plan and Construction Regulations will soon be drafted and the Subdivision Ordinance will be updated following their completion.

Using traffic flows, accidents and future land use development patterns, the Transportation Plan has identified a series of projects that will help meet the present and future transportation demands of Harrison County. The major projects in the Transportation Plan would be funded as Federal Aid Projects with Harrison County covering the local share. The remaining projects would be totally funded by Harrison County. The major projects are on both existing and proposed roadways that currently realize high traffic volumes, or are predicted to realize high traffic volumes following their construction. The existing roadways are currently classified, or will be reclassified, as Major Collectors on the State Functional Classification System. The proposed roadways are currently not on the State Functional Classification System. These roadways will be added to the system as Major Collectors. Being classified as Major Collectors makes the roadways eligible for county officials to seek Federal Funding for $80 \%$ of the construction and construction engineering/inspection costs. There are ten (10) projects that have been identified as major projects that would qualify as Federal Aid Projects as shown in Figure 7. The combined cost of these 10 major projects is approximately between $\$ 131,526,900$ and $\$ 137,277,800$. These costs are in current day (2002) dollars. The projects to be funded with Harrison County funds are shown in Figure 18.

Harrison County Officials are in the process of developing both a Thoroughfare Plan and Road Construction Regulations. They are also in the process of updating their Subdivision Ordinance. The Thoroughfare Plan will identify specific county roads as arterials, major collectors and minor collectors. The right-of-way needs for each of these types of roads will be developed. As development occurs in Harrison County along these major roads, the developer can use the Thoroughfare Plan as a guide to right-of-way required on that particular roadway. The Road Construction Regulations will provide the developer with county approved design, plan development and construction specifications, as well as provide construction standard drawings. This will assist county officials and developers in obtaining consistency in newly developing areas and will provide developers with county requirements in the early planning stages of a development. The Thoroughfare Plan should be adopted as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and should be included in the updated Subdivision Ordinance.
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## INTRODUCTION

In 2002, the Harrison County Board of Commissioners contracted with Bernardin, Lochmueller \& Associates, Inc. (BLA), to prepare a Transportation Plan and to update the Functional Classification Map for Harrison County. Upon completion of the Transportation Plan and the Functional Classification Map update, Road Construction Regulations will be developed, the Subdivision Ordinance will be updated, the Comprehensive Plan will be updated and a Thoroughfare Plan will be developed.

A series of two (2) Public Meetings were held at the Harrison County Courthouse to gain public insight into the Transportation Plan. The first meeting was held very early in the Transportation Plan development process. Comments related to current and future transportation problem areas were taken from those in attendance. These comments, along with an analysis of traffic flow, accidents and land use development, were used to identify a series of projects to be included in the Transportation Plan that will meet the present and future transportation demands of Harrison County.

The second meeting was held after the development of costs associated with 10 major projects in the Transportation Plan. Its purpose was to present the public and other local officials with the preliminary list of major projects and associated costs, and to provide another opportunity for their input.

For the major projects on the existing roadways, the roadways either are currently classified, or will be reclassified, as Major Collectors on the State Functional Classification System. For the major projects on newly proposed roadway alignments, that are currently not on the State Functional Classification System, these roadways will be added to the system as Major Collectors. Being classified as Major Collectors makes the roadways eligible for county officials to seek Federal Funding for $80 \%$ of the construction and construction engineering/inspection costs.

Some of these major projects are currently being studied or have been studied in the past. These projects include:

## 1. I-64 and S.R. 337 Interchange

- The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) has established a need for this interchange in their Statewide Interchange Study and in their current Long Range Plan.
- An "Overview Study for a New Interchange on I-64 West of S.R. 135" has been developed by American Consulting Engineers, Inc., for the Harrison County Commissioners.

2. Crandall-Lanesville Road Extension to the North from I-64 to S.R. 64

- The "Lanesville Interchange Master Plan" prepared by Birch, Trautwein \& Mims, Inc., for the Harrison County Plan Commission, addresses the need for this extension as well as other improvements to the Lanesville Interchange roadway system.

3. East-West Roadway in the Southern Portion of the County

- Two (2) options are discussed in this Transportation Plan for this roadway. The Watson Lane option is currently being studied by PDR Engineers, Inc.

4. Corydon-New Middletown Road/New Middletown-Elizabeth Road from S.R. 62 to Elizabeth

- This roadway is currently being studied by PDR Engineers, Inc.

In addition to the major projects that could be completed as Federal Aid Projects, the Transportation Plan has also identified individual projects that would improve the safety of existing roadway facilities. These improvements are on roadways that are generally classified lower than a Major Collector and, therefore, are not eligible for Federal Funding for construction and construction engineering/inspection costs. Improvements to these roadways would be funded utilizing local funds. However, INDOT has some Hazard Elimination funding available for "spot" repairs to a roadway. These projects might include an improvement such as the straightening of a curve or the removal of a hill to improve sight distance.

The Transportation Plan has also identified several roadway improvements that could become more important 20 years or more into the future. These potential projects would not be part of the 10 to 20 year time frame covered by this Transportation Plan. These improvements could be considered at a later date as Harrison County continues to develop industrially, commercially and residentially.

As mentioned above, Harrison County Officials are in the process of developing both a Thoroughfare Plan and Road Construction Regulations. They are also in the process of updating the county Subdivision Ordinance. The Thoroughfare Plan will identify specific county roads as arterials, major collectors and minor collectors. The right-of-way needs for each of these types of roads will be developed. As development occurs in Harrison County along these major roads, the developer can use the Thoroughfare Plan as a guide to right-of-way required on that particular roadway. The Road Construction Regulations will provide the developer with county approved design, plan development and construction specifications, as well as provide construction standard drawings. This will assist county officials and developers in obtaining consistency in newly developing areas and will provide developers with county requirements in the early planning stages of a development. The Thoroughfare Plan should be adopted as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and should be included in the updated Subdivision Ordinance.

This report will present the Harrison County Transportation Plan and the projects that are a part of the Plan. Ten (10) of these projects have been identified as major projects that could be Federal Aid Projects. The remaining improvements would be locally funded. The costs of these ten (10) major projects will be included as well as the changes needed in the Functional Classification System for funding of these projects. This Transportation Plan has been developed to replace the Transportation Plan contained in Chapter IV, pages 61-65, of the Harrison County Comprehensive Plan, approved by the Harrison County Commissioners in 1996.
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## EXISTING TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

## Existing Transportation Problems - Accidents

Problems in the existing transportation system can be identified in the form of accidents and congestion. Accidents are the result of a variety of problems, which may include narrow roadways, restricted sight distance for the driver(s), horizontal alignment problems (sharp curves), vertical alignment problems (hills and valleys), restricted intersection sight distance for the driver(s), excessive vehicle speeds, unanticipated road characteristics creating driver confusion and misjudgment, and in cases simple driver error.

The Center for Advancement of Transportation Safety (CATS), at Purdue University, compiles accident records for the State of Indiana and Indiana Counties. CATS annually provide an analysis and summary of the crash data that they compile and analyze. The 1998 and 1999 Harrison County Accident Statistics, as provided by CATS, are contained in Appendix C.

Table 1-1998 and 1999 Harrison County Accident Summary - provides a brief summary of the Harrison County Accident Statistics, as provided by CATS. The rural accidents are those that occur outside of one of the cities or towns within Harrison County. These cities or towns are: Corydon, Crandall, Elizabeth, Laconia, Lanesville, Mauckport, Milltown, New Middletown and Palmyra.

|  | Cities or Towns |  | Rural Areas |  | TOTAL |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 9 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ |
| Total Number of Accidents | 236 | 218 | 1011 | 1029 | 1247 | 1247 |
| Number of Fatal Accidents | 4 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 4 |
| Number of Fatalities | 4 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 12 | 4 |
| Number of Injuries | 60 | 49 | 392 | 378 | 452 | 427 |
| Total Cost of <br> (millions of dollars) | $\$ 4.77$ | $\$ 1.51$ | $\$ 14.62$ | $\$ 12.23$ | $\$ 19.39$ | $\$ 13.74$ |

Source: Center for Advancement of Transportation Safety (CATS), at Purdue University.
Table 1-1998 and 1999 Harrison County Accident Summary

Table 1 indicates that the total number of accidents and injuries for Harrison County remained essentially the same from 1998 to 1999. The number of fatalities decreased from 12 in 1998 to 4 in 1999. The Total Costs of Accidents also decreased from $\$ 19.39$ to $\$ 13.74$ million dollars.

The Center for Advancement of Transportation Safety (CATS) has also provided accident data for Harrison County roadways using accident records for 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998 and 1999. This data was analyzed and a list of the high accident locations within Harrison County was developed. The top accident locations for Harrison County intersections and roadways are listed in Table 2 and in Table 3 and are shown in Figure 1. The 1995-1999 Harrison County Accident Data, as provided by CATS, is contained in Appendix D.

| TOTAL NUMBER OF <br> ACCIDENTS |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| 18 | INTERSECTION |
| 17 | Corydon-Ramsey Road and Sival Road |
| 16 | Corydon-Ramsey Road and Rocky Meadow Road |
| 15 | Corydon-Ramsey Road and Lost Creek Road |
| 15 | Corydon-Ramsey Road and Quarry Road |
| 13 | Lanesville Road and Corydon Ridge Road |
| 11 | Bradford Road and New Cut Road |
| 11 | Heidelberg Road and S.R. 135 |
| 11 | New Middletown Road and Turley Road |
| 11 | Whiskey Run Road and S.R. 135 |
| 10 | Corydon-New Middletown Road and S.R. 62 |
| 9 | Corydon-Ramsey Road and Pennington Chapel Road |
| 9 | Corydon-Ramsey Road and S.R. 64 |
| 9 | Old S.R. 135 and Heidelberg Road |
| 9 | Shiloh Road and S.R. 337 |
| 9 | Union Chapel Road and Wiseman Road |

Source: Center for Advancement of Transportation Safety (CATS), at Purdue University.
Table 2 - Harrison County High Accident Intersection Locations

| TOTAL <br> NUMBER OF <br> ACCIDENTS | ROADWAY | ROADWAY LIMITS |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 176 | Corydon-Ramsey Road | S.R. 62 to U.S. 150. |
| 72 | Corydon-Ridge Road | From Corydon to Floyd County Line |
| 62 | Whiskey Run Road | From Corydon-Ramsey Road to Floyd County Line |
| 48 | Crandall-Lanesville Road | From S.R. 62 to Crandall |
| 41 | Bradford Road | From S.R. 135 to Floyd County Line |
| 38 | Old Forest Road | From S.R. 462 to Corydon-Ramsey Road |
| 36 | New Middletown-Elizabeth Road | From New Middletown to Elizabeth |
| 34 | Heidelberg Road | From Brown-Cunningham Road to Old S.R. 135 |
| 33 | Rosewood Road | From S.R. 111 to S.R. 11 |
| 32 | Corydon-New Middletown Road | From Fogel Road to S.R. 62 |
| 30 | Fredricksberg Road | From S.R. 64 to Washington County Line |
| 29 | Union Chapel Road | From Old Goshen Road to S.R. 135 |
| 28 | Shiloh Road | From Brown-Cunningham Road to Fogel Road |

Source: Center for Advancement of Transportation Safety (CATS), at Purdue University.
Table 3 - Harrison County High Accident Roadway Locations

Table 2 shows that intersections with heavily traveled state highway routes experience many accidents. Most of the high accident locations occur on roadways that are near and/or feed the Corydon area. These are the roads that experience the higher traffic volumes, as shown in Figure 2. Most of the intersections and roadways that exhibit a high number of accidents are a part of this Transportation Plan. Some are among the ten (10) major projects that would be funded as Federal Aid Projects with Harrison County covering the local share, and others are among those projects that would be totally funded by Harrison County.
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## Existing and Future Land Use

The Harrison County Comprehensive Plan provided growth objectives and development policies for the county. Population and employment forecasts and a future land use development plan were also developed. Figure 3 shows the Harrison County Land Use Plan according to the Comprehensive Plan.

According to the Harrison County Comprehensive Plan, the population of Harrison County in 1980 was 27,276 . By 1990, the population had increased by approximately $9.6 \%$ to 29,890 . According to the U.S. Bureau of Census, the population had increased to 34,325 in 2000, a $14.8 \%$ increase. According to the Lanesville Interchange Master Plan, the Indiana Business Research Center, in its Harrison County profile, projects that the 2020 population of Harrison County will reach 42,317 persons, or a $23.3 \%$ increase over the 2000 population.


Source: Harrison County Comprehensive Plan, Lanesville Interchange Master Plan
Figure 4 - Population Trends and Forecasts for Harrison County

Population increases as those seen in Harrison County and represented in Figure 4, will be reflected in the growth and development of new and existing subdivisions and multi-family housing facilities. For the Harrison County transportation system, the continued growth in subdivisions will put even greater stresses on the existing system, resulting in continued congestion and accidents.

Along with the growth in population, Harrison County has also seen growth in total employment. According to the Harrison County Comprehensive Plan, the employment by selected industries agriculture, mining, contract construction, manufacturing, transportation and public utilities, wholesale and retail trade, finance, insurance, real estate, and public administration - of Harrison County in 1970 was 1,978. In 1980, the employment by the selected industries had increased by
approximately $82.2 \%$ to 3,603 . In 1990, the employment by the selected industries had increased by approximately $80.2 \%$ to 6,491 . According to the Highlights of Harrison County, Indiana, 2001 Edition published by the Indiana Department of Workforce Development, the employment by the selected industries had increased to 11,837 in 2000 , an $82.4 \%$ increase.


Source: Harrison County Comprehensive Plan, Highlights of Harrison County, Indiana, 2001 Edition published by the Indiana Department of Workforce Development

Figure 5 - Employment Trends by Industry for Harrison County

The growth in total employment shown in Figure 5 represents new challenges to the transportation system in industrial and commercial areas. While many of these jobs will be service and retail oriented, there will be some high-paying goods producing jobs.

This Transportation Plan must address these future transportation needs in both the residential areas as well as the commercial and industrial areas. The Harrison County Comprehensive Plan will help guide growth in Harrison County and as a part of the needed infrastructure, local roads will need to be upgraded to accommodate this growth.

## Existing Transportation Problems - Traffic Flow

During the 1990's and 2000's the rapid residential growth in Harrison County, as shown above in Figure 4, and the rapid commercial and industrial growth in Harrison County, as shown above in Figure 5, translated into increases in traffic volumes on local and state highways. Figure 2 shows 1998 and 1999 traffic counts on various Harrison County roads, State highways in Harrison County and some State Highways in Floyd County. Traffic volumes on State highways in Harrison County and Floyd County can also be found in Appendix B. The highest traffic counts on Harrison County roads are found on Crandall-Lanesville Road, Quarry Road, CorydonRamsey and Old Forest Road, Corydon-New Middletown and New Middletown-Elizabeth Road, St. Johns Church Road, Corydon Ridge Road and Shiloh Road.

FIGURE 3
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## PROJECTS IN THE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Using the accidents, traffic volumes and future land use, a series of projects for the Transportation Plan for Harrison County were developed. These projects included improvements that would be funded solely by Harrison County and improvements funded as Federal Aid Projects. The locally funded projects are shown on Figure 18. The Federal Aid Projects are shown on Figure 7 and listed in Table 4. Each of these projects were drawn on aerial maps and U.S. Geological Survey maps so that engineering design standards, with regard to curves and grades, could be applied.

## INDOT Transportation Improvements in Harrison County

The State highways within the Harrison County limits make up a portion of the collector roadways, all of the arterial roadways and interstates in the county. They are designed to carry large numbers of vehicles, as well as heavy-duty trucks. The projects in the Transportation Plan should take advantage of the capacity of the state routes where applicable. Figure 6 shows the State Highways in Harrison County.

The backbone of the Harrison County transportation system is the State highway system. Interstate 64 bisects the county, with the Lanesville interchange within the jurisdiction of the Harrison County Plan Commission. The Corydon interchange at S.R. 135 is the only other existing interchange within the county, although it is not within the planning and zoning jurisdiction of the county.

The east-west State highways provide linkages to the north-south roadways and access to many small communities within the county. A number of east-west State highways provide connections outside of the county and accommodate through traffic. East-west connections in the northern portion of the county include S.R. 64 and S.R. 150. East-west connections in the central portion of the county include I-64 and S.R. 62. East-west connections in the southern portion of the county are limited with the presence of the Ohio River that borders the southwest, south and southeast regions of the county.

In 1992, the General Assembly passed a resolution creating the Ohio River Scenic Byway along the Ohio River in southern Indiana. With that resolution, the route was established as a scenic byway that winds through the river valley along the Ohio River from Lawrenceburg to Mount Vernon, passing through Harrison County. S.R. 62 through Harrison County is a part of this scenic route and corridor. With the creation of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) mandating the creation of a national scenic byways program, the Ohio River Scenic Byway was eligible for designation as a scenic byway and received that status in September
1996. This designation makes additional Federal funds available for roadway improvements, roadside parks, interpretive areas, visitor's centers, etc. along the S.R. 62 corridor. The route passes through Corydon and other central portions of Harrison County. In order to receive the national designation, the route was required to have a Corridor Management Plan. A committee called the Ohio River Scenic Route Committee was formed and each county in which the route passes through has a representative on the committee. The committee also has representatives from INDOT, Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, Historic Southern Indiana, and the Tourism Division of the Indiana Department of Commerce. From this committee, needed improvements and new tourist amenities will be developed that will be a benefit for the entire county.

The north-south State highways generally serve as linkages to I-64 (see Figure 6). S.R. 135 bisects the county and bypasses Corydon on the west side. The Corydon interchange at S.R. 135 and I-64 is the only existing State highway interchange within the county. S.R. 135 is also the Ohio River only crossing point into Kentucky within Harrison County. S.R. 11 and S.R. 111 provide north-south access from the southern portion of the county to Floyd County and eventually to I-64. S.R. 337 provides access from the south-central portion of the county to the northwestern portion of the county at S.R. 64. S.R. 337 currently crosses over I-64 just west of Corydon. There is no existing interchange at S.R. 337 to provide access to I-64.

Other State highways within the county provide access from other State highways to specific points of interest. S.R. 462 provides access from S.R. 62 to the Harrison State Forest in the west-central portion of the county. S.R. 335 provides access from S.R. 135, just north of Corydon, to Crandall and on north to S.R. 64. S.R. 211 provides access from S.R. 11 to S.R. 111 in the east-central portion of the county, just south of Caesars Indiana Riverboat.

The INDOT 2000-2025 Long Range Plan for Harrison County indicates no major roadway construction within the county. In their long-range plan, INDOT has established a need for a new interchange at I-64 and Gethsemane Road/S.R. 337. The INDOT Long Range Plan states that an additional study is needed for this "potential" interchange to confirm its' benefits, preferred location, consensus (local support) and justification. Portions of the INDOT 20002025 Long Range Plan can be found in Appendix E. An "Overview Study for a New Interchange on I-64 West of S.R. 135" has been developed by American Consulting Engineers, Inc., for the Harrison County Commissioners. According to this document, both Harrison County and the Town of Corydon have passed resolutions in 1999 or 2000 supporting a second interchange at Corydon.

The INDOT Statewide Transportation Improvement Program FY 2002- FY 2004 for Harrison County indicates two (2) bridge replacement projects are scheduled FY 2002. These projects are the Bridge \#65 over Indian Creek on Circle Road @ \$630,000.00, of which \$126,000.00 are local funds, and the Bridge \#57 over Indian Creek on Mathis Road @ \$900,000.00, of which $\$ 180,000.00$ are local funds. There are no roadway reconstruction projects included in this schedule for Harrison County. Portions of the INDOT Statewide Transportation Improvement Program FY 2002- FY 2004 can be found in Appendix F.

## Harrison County Transportation Improvements

It is important for the Harrison County Transportation Plan to work together with the State highway system within the county. There are ten (10) Federal Aid Projects identified as being part of the Transportation Plan for Harrison County. These projects are designed to improve the safety of the motoring public, reduce accidents, improve capacity, accommodate existing and future traffic flow, and meet future land use needs. These projects are shown in Figure 7 and listed in Table 4. A brief description of each project and its purpose are presented in the table. A more detailed description of each project and its purpose follows the table. These projects are not in any priority order.

Table 5 shows the projects and their associated costs. It is important to note that all costs contained in Table 5 are estimates based on general information, approximations and engineering judgment. They are by no means exact, although they are reasonable. Additionally, the environmental, engineering and construction engineering/inspection fees are generally estimated as a percentage of the construction cost estimate for this phase in the project development. It should also be noted that these fees, as well as right-of-way fees, are estimates and could change when a scope of work is defined for each project during the development of a design and/or construction engineering contract. All projects may have utility relocations associated with them that are not quantified in this report. The project construction cost calculations are contained in Appendix G and right-of-way cost calculations are contained in Appendix H. Costs for the Proposed I-64 and S.R. 337 Interchange Project were provided by the "Overview Study for a New Interchange at I-64 west of S.R. 135" by American Consulting, Inc. Costs for the Watson Road Extension and the Corydon-New Middletown/New Middletown-Elizabeth Road projects were provided by PDR Engineers, Inc., as a part of their corridor study. The cost of each project was determined for the following:

> Environmental Analysis and Preliminary Engineering (Design and Field Survey) Right-of Way (R/W Acquisition, R/W Engineering and R/W Services) Construction
> Construction Engineering/Inspection

The roadways associated with these ten (10) projects are currently classified as or will be reclassified to Major Collectors on the State Functional Classification System. Major Collector routes serve three (3) purposes. One purpose is to serve county seats not on arterial routes, larger towns not directly served by the arterials and interstates, and other traffic generators of equivalent intracounty importance, such as consolidated schools, shipping points, county parks, and important mining and agricultural areas. A second purpose is to link these places with nearby larger towns and cities, or with routes of higher classifications. The third purpose is to serve the more important intracounty travel corridors. Being classified as Major Collectors makes the roadways eligible for county officials to seek Federal Funding for $80 \%$ of the construction and construction engineering/inspection costs.

FIGURE 6


| ROAD NAME | PROJECT DESCRIPTION | PROJECT PURPOSE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crandall-Lanesville Rd. | New roadway to connect S.R. 64 to I-64 at the Lanesville Interchange. | Develop north-south corridor from S.R. 64 to I-64 to open land development at interchange. |
| Corydon-Ramsey Road | Reconstruct and widen existing roadway from +/- 265, South of S.R. 62 at Old Forrest Road to Quarry Road. | Increase capacity to rapidly developing areas. |
| I-64 and Gethsemane Road/S.R. 337 Interchange | New interchange at I-64 and S.R. 337. <br> Realign S.R. 337 from Quarry Rd. to I-64 at new interchange. <br> Includes a connector spur reconnecting realigned S.R. 337 to existing S.R. 337 to the east. <br> Includes a connector spur connecting realigned S.R. 337 to S.R. 62 to the south. <br> The existing S.R. 337 bridge over I-64 is to remain. | Provide direct access to I-64, improve traffic flow within local and regional transportation system and improve Level of Service of S.R. 135 interchange. |
| New Connector Between S.R. 337 and CorydonRamsey Road | New roadway to connect the proposed connector spur from the proposed S.R. 337 interchange to existing S.R. 337 to Corydon-Ramsey Road to the east. | Improve traffic flow to commercial/industrial areas. |
| Heidelberg Road | Reconstruct, widen and realign portions of existing roadway from $+/-800$ ' west of S.R. 135 to Old S.R. 135. New roadway from Old S.R. 135 to S.R. 337 at School Street/Country Club Road. | Improve access to southwestern portion of Corydon. Provide safer access to schools. |
| East-West Road in Southern part of county (select one project): <br> 1. Watson Road Extension Project <br> 2. Lake Road/Buck Valley Creek Road Project | 1. Reconstruct, widen and realign portions of existing Watson Rd. from S.R. 135 to Union Chapel Rd. New roadway from Union Chapel Rd. to S.R. 11 intersection. <br> 2. Reconstruct, widen and realign portions of existing Lake Rd. and Buck Valley Creek Rd. from S.R. 135 to New Middletown-Elizabeth Rd. | Improve east-west transportation system in southern portion of county. Develop east-west corridor between S.R. 135 and S.R. 11. Develop east-west corridor between S.R. 135 and New-Middletown-Elizabeth Rd. |
| Shiloh Road/Fogel Roa | Reconstruct, widen and realign portions of existing Shiloh Rd. and Fogel Rd. from S.R. 337 to New Middleton-Elizabeth Rd. | Improve access to southeastern portion of Corydon and land uses in the area. |
| New Connector Between S.R. 135 and Big Indian Road | New roadway from S.R. 135 to Big Indian Road. | Improve access to eastern portion of Corydon and land uses in the area. |
| Corydon-New <br>  <br> New Middletown- <br> Elizabeth Road | Reconstruct, widen and realign portions of existing Corydon-New Middletown Rd. from S.R. 62 to New Middletown. <br> Reconstruct, widen and realign portions of existing New Middletown-Elizabeth Rd. from New Middletown to Elizabeth. | Improve north-south and eastwest transportation system in southeastern portion of county and land uses in the area. <br> Improve safety and access to rural communities. |
| Quarry Road | New roadway from North Gethsemane Road to S.R. 337. | Improve access to commercial/industrial areas. |

Source: Bernardin-Lochmueller \& Assoc., Inc.

## Table 4 - Projects in the Harrison County Transportation Plan

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROAD } \\ & \text { NAME } \end{aligned}$ | ENV./ENG. COSTS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RIGHT- } \\ & \text { OF-WAY } \\ & \text { COSTS } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | CONST. <br> COSTS | CONST. <br> ENG./INSP. <br> COSTS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & \text { COST } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crandall-Lanesville Rd. | \$902,400 | \$722,500 | \$9,000,000 | \$1,350,000 | \$11,974,900 |
| Corydon-Ramsey Road | \$911,400 | \$3,301,000 | \$9,300,000 | \$1,395,000 | \$14,907,400 |
| I-64 and Gethsemane Road/S.R. 337 Interchange | \$2,240,000 * | \$610,000 * | \$21,410,000 * |  | \$24,260,000 * |
| New Connector Between S.R. 337 and CorydonRamsey Road (Option 1) | \$142,400 | \$82,000 | \$1,400,000 | \$210,000 | \$1,834,400 |
| New Connector Between S.R. 337 and CorydonRamsey Road (Option 2) | \$322,800 | \$893,500 | \$3,200,000 | \$480,000 | \$4,896,300 |
| Heidelberg Road | \$310,200 | \$779,000 | \$2,900,000 | \$435,000 | \$4,424,200 |
| East-West Road in Southern part of county (select one of the following projects): <br> 1. Watson Road Extension Project <br> 2. Lake Road/Buck Valley Creek Road Project | $\begin{gathered} \$ 1,455,800{ }^{* *} \\ \$ 1,608,800 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 619,000 * * \\ & \$ 1,200,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 13,500,000 \text { ** } \\ \$ 15,200,000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 2,025,000 \text { ** } \\ \$ 2,280,000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 17,599,800 * * \\ \$ 20,288,800 \end{gathered}$ |
| Shiloh Road/Fogel Road | \$565,800 | \$1,402,500 | \$5,300,000 | \$795,000 | \$8,063,300 |
| New Connector Between S.R. 135 and Big Indian Road | \$745,200 | \$599,000 | \$7,800,000 | \$1,170,000 | \$10,314,200 |
| Corydon-New <br>  <br> New Middletown- <br> Elizabeth Road | \$2,535,800 ** | \$3,225,000 ** | \$25,500,000 ** | \$3,825,000 ** | \$35,085,800 ** |
| Quarry Road | \$245,400 | \$172,500 | \$2,300,000 | \$345,000 | \$3,062,900 |
| TOTAL (MAX.) |  |  |  |  | \$137,277,800 |

Source: Bernardin-Lochmueller \& Assoc., Inc.

* Costs from "Overview Study for New Interchange, I-64 west of S.R. 135" by American Consulting, Inc.
** Costs for the Watson Road Extension and the Corydon-New Middletown/New MiddletownElizabeth Road projects were provided by PDR Engineers, Inc., as a part of their corridor study.

Table 5 -Transportation Plan Projects and Associated Costs (2002 Dollars)

## FIGURE 7



## Crandall-Lanesville Road (see Figure 8)

Project Location: From I-64 interchange at Lanesville, north to S.R. 64.
Project Length: $\quad 12,180$ feet ( 2.31 miles $)$

Project Description: - Add 3 new lanes to existing 2 lanes (5-lane total) rural section from I-64 to Old Lanesville Road ( 2560 feet) ( 0.49 miles).

- New 3 lane rural section and $\mathrm{R} / \mathrm{W}$ from Old Lanesville Road to S.R. 64 ( 9620 feet) ( 1.82 miles).
- Grade separation Rail Road crossing at Norfolk Southern Rail Road with new bridge. New bridge to be located in a section of the rail road that is in a cut section to minimize bridge length and construction costs.

Project Termini: Connect I-64 (Interstate) to S.R. 64 (Major Collector)
Current Functional Classification: Existing Roadway - Major Collector
New Roadway not currently classified - to be classified as a Major Collector.

Current ADT: $\quad+/-200$ v.p.d.; Estimated 4,500 v.p.d. following construction.
Benefits:

- Connect I-64 (Interstate) and S.R. 64 (Major Collector)
- Relieve congestion on S.R. 64 in Georgetown.
- Relieve congestion at I-64 interchange at Georgetown.
- Improve traffic flow between S.R. 64 and I-64.
- Provide access to industrial and commercial area at Lanesville Interchange.

FIGURE 8


## Corydon-Ramsey Road (see Figure 9)

Project Location: From approximately 420 feet south of S.R. 62 at Old Forest Road, north to Quarry Road.

Project Length: $\quad 9,810$ feet ( 1.86 miles)
Project Description: - Improve Corydon-Ramsey Rd. and S.R. 62 intersection with addition of turn lanes and new traffic signal. ( 420 feet) ( 0.08 miles).

- Reconstruct new 3 lane urban section and R/W from S.R. 62 to S.R. 337. ( 4,530 feet) ( 0.86 miles).
- Reconstruct new 5 lane urban section and R/W from S.R. 337 to I-64 overpass. ( 2,410 feet) ( 0.46 miles).
- Reconstruct Corydon-Ramsey Road bridge over I-64 to a 5 lane structure ( 250 feet) ( 0.04 miles).
- Reconstruct 5 lane rural section from I-64 overpass to Quarry Road. (2200 feet) ( 0.42 miles).

Project Termini: Connect S.R. 62 (Major Collector) to Quarry Road (Major Collector following reclassification)

Current Functional Classification: Minor Collector - To be reclassified as a Major Collector.

Current ADT: $\quad+/-3323$ v.p.d.
Benefits: • Connect S.R. 62 (Major Collector) to S.R. 337 (Major Collector) to Quarry Road (Major Collector following reclassification).

- Increase capacity to rapidly developing industrial, commercial and residential areas.
- Relieve congestion at Corydon-Ridge Rd. and S.R. 62.
- Realign horizontal curves to improve sight distance.
- Correct vertical alignment to improve sight distance.
- Improved traffic flow and safer facility.

FIGURE 9


## I-64 and Gethsemane Road/S.R. 337 Interchange (see Figure 10)

The INDOT has established a need for this interchange in their Statewide Interchange Study and in their current INDOT 2000-2025 Long Range Plan. The INDOT Long Range Plan states that an additional study is needed for this "potential" interchange to confirm its' benefits, preferred location, consensus (local support) and justification. Portions of the INDOT 2000-2025 Long Range Plan can be found in Appendix E. This interchange is also further discussed in the "Overview Study for a New Interchange I-64 West of S.R. 135", as completed by American Consulting Engineers, Inc., for the Harrison County Commissioners. According to this document, both Harrison County and the Town of Corydon have passed resolutions in 1999 or 2000 supporting a second interchange at Corydon.

Project Location: Between the existing Gethsemane Road bridge over I-64 and the existing S.R. 337 bridge over I-64.

Project Length: $\quad$ Total of all roadways and ramps $=23,410$ feet ( 4.44 miles $)$.

- $\quad$ Quarry Road Realignment $=3,150$ feet ( 0.60 miles).
- S.R. 337 realignment from Quarry Rd. to existing S.R. 337 bridge over I- $64=2,400$ feet ( 0.45 miles).
- New S.R. 337 roadway, bridge over I-64 and connector spur to S.R. 62, including S.R. 337 bridge over I-64 = 5,290 feet ( 1.00 miles).
- Connector spur connecting realigned S.R. 337 to existing S.R. 337 to east $=3,730$ feet ( 0.71 miles).
- New exit/entrance ramps to I-64 = 2 @ 4,420 feet ( 0.84 miles $)=8,840$ feet ( 1.67 miles $)$.

Project Description:

- Realign Quarry Road to correct angle of intersection with S.R. 337 (2-lane rural).
- Realign and reconstruct existing S.R. 337 from Quarry Road to existing S.R. 337 near the existing S.R. 337 bridge over I-64 (2-lane rural).
- Existing S.R. 337 bridge over I-64 to remain.
- Realign S.R. 337 from Quarry Rd. to new bridge over I-64 and new interchange (2-lane rural).
- Construct new interchange consisting of new exit/entrance ramps to and from I-64 and S.R. 337 bridge over I-64.
- Construct connector spur from new S.R. 337 interchange to S.R. 62 to the south (2-lane rural).
- Construct connector spur from new S.R. 337 interchange to existing S.R. 337 to the east (2-lane rural).

Project Termini: - Realign Quarry Road.

- Realign existing S.R. 337 from Quarry Rd. to existing S.R. 337 bridge over I-64.
- Connect new S.R. 337 interchange with S.R. 62 to the south.
- Connect new S.R. 337 interchange with existing S.R. 337 to the east.
- New interchange provides interstate access to I-64 from S.R. 337.

Current Functional Classification: Major Collector
Current ADT: 1050 v.p.d. on existing S.R. 337 just south of Quarry Road.
Benefits: $\quad$ Provide direct access to I-64 from S.R. 337.

- Connect S.R. 62 (Major Collector) to S.R. 337 (Major Collector) to Quarry Road (Major Collector following reclassification).
- Increase capacity to rapidly developing industrial, commercial and residential areas.
- Improve Level of Service at I-64 and S.R. 135 interchange at Corydon.
- Improve angle of intersection at S.R. 337 and Quarry Road.
- Realign horizontal curves on S.R. 337 to improve sight distance.
- Improved traffic flow within local and regional transportation system and provide a safer facility.


## FIGURE 10



## New Connector Between S.R. 337 and Corydon-Ramsey Road (see Figure 11)

Two (2) separate options for this project were investigated.
Option 1 is a shorter route that has a series of horizontal curves associated with it to provide adequate angles of intersection with both S.R. 337 and Corydon-Ramsey Road. This would likely be the preferred option if the proposed I-64 and S.R. 337 interchange fails to develop. This option is also a part of the preliminary plans for the hospital that may be constructed just south of the roadway alignment.

Option 2 includes the realignment of a portion of S.R. 337 to correct some horizontal curve deficiencies. The connector route from this realigned S.R. 337 to Corydon-Ramsey Road is much straighter and more direct. This option would likely be the preferred option if the proposed I-64 and S.R. 337 interchange develops. Some modifications to the hospital plans would likely be required if this option is selected.

```
Project Location: From S.R. }337\mathrm{ to Corydon-Ramsey Road, on south side of and parallel to I-64.
Project Length: \(\quad \frac{\text { Option 1: }}{\text { Option 2. }} 2,350\) feet ( 0.45 miles)
    Option 2:
    Connector Road = 2,220 feet (0.42 miles)
    S.R. }337\mathrm{ Realignment = 2,400 feet ( }0.45\mathrm{ miles)
```


## Project Description: Option 1:

New 4 lane rural section and R/W from S.R. 337 to Corydon-Ramsey Road.
Option 2:
New 4 lane rural section and R/W from existing S.R. 337 to Corydon-Ramsey Road.

- New 4 lane rural section and R/W from existing S.R. 337 just south of I-64 to existing S.R. 337 approximately 1600 feet south.

Project Termini: Connect S.R. 337 (Major Collector) to Corydon-Ramsey Road (Major Collector following reclassification)

Current Functional Classification: New roadway not on Functional Classification Map - To be classified as a Major Collector. S.R. 337 Classified as a Major Collector.

Current ADT: $\quad$ N/A - no existing roadway.
S.R. 337 ADT $=1050$ v.p.d.

## Benefits: Option 1

- Connect S.R. 337 (Major Collector) to Corydon-Ramsey Road (Major Collector following reclassification).
- Increase capacity to rapidly developing industrial, commercial and residential areas in area south of I-64 and between S.R. 337 and S.R. 135.
- Extends connector spur from proposed I-64 and S.R. 337 Interchange to Corydon-Ramsey Road.
- Part of roadway plan for preliminary hospital plans.


## Option 2:

- More direct connection, with straighter alignment, of S.R. 337 (Major Collector) to Corydon-Ramsey Road (Major Collector following reclassification).
- Increase capacity to rapidly developing industrial, commercial and residential areas in area south of I-64 and between S.R. 337 and S.R. 135.
- More direct extension of connector spur from proposed I64 and S.R. 337 Interchange to Corydon-Ramsey Road.
- Improve horizontal curves along S.R. 337 and improved sight distance.

FIGURE 11


## Heidelberg Road (see Figure 12)

Project Location: From approximately 800 feet west of S.R. 135 to S.R. 337 at School Street/Country Club Road.

Project Length: $\quad 6,500$ feet ( 1.23 miles)
Project Description: - Improve Heidelberg Road and S.R. 135 angle of intersection with realignment of Heidelberg Road approach on west side of S.R. 135. ( 800 feet) ( 0.15 miles).

- Reconstruct new 2 lane rural section and R/W from S.R. 135 to Old S.R. 135. Realign approximately 2,200 feet ( 0.42 miles) and follow existing alignment for approximately 2,200 feet ( 0.42 miles).
- New 2 lane rural roadway and R/W from Old S.R. 135 to S.R. 337 at School Street/Country Club Rd. (1,275 feet) ( 0.24 miles).

Project Termini: Connect S.R. 135 (Minor Arterial) to S.R. 337 (Major Collector) at School Street/Country Club Road and direct access to schools.

Current Functional Classification: Minor Collector - To be reclassified as a Major Collector.
New roadway not classified - to be classified as a Major Collector.

Current ADT: 650 v.p.d
Benefits: • Possible County/City joint venture as new roadway portion of project from Old S.R. 135 to S.R. 337 is within Corydon Corporate Limits ( 1275 feet) ( 0.24 miles).

- Connect S.R. 135 (Minor Arterial) to S.R. 337 (Major Collector) at School Street/Country Club Road and direct, safer access to schools.
- Improve access to southwestern portion of Corydon.
- Safer facility with intersection and roadway realignment.
- Relieve traffic from W. Loweth Avenue and Ashton Drive, residential streets.
- Realign horizontal curves to improve sight distance.
- Improve turning radii and intersection sight distance at S.R. 135 intersection.
- Improved traffic flow and safer facility.


## FIGURE 12



## East-West Roadway in Southern Portion of the County (see Figure 13)

Two (2) separate options for this project were investigated. Option 1 is the Watson Road Extension Project and is currently being studied by PDR Engineers, Inc. The following information related to Option 1 was provided by PDR Engineers, Inc. from their draft report of the corridor study. Option 2 is the Lake Road/Buck Creek Valley Road Project and is discussed on the next page.

## Option 1 (Watson Road)

Project Location: $\quad$ From S.R. 135 to S.R. 11.
Project Length: $\quad 26,200$ feet ( 4.96 miles).
Project Description: - Reconstruct new 2 lane rural section from S.R. 135 to Union Chapel Road. ( 11,900 feet) ( 2.25 miles)

- Realign Union Chapel Road intersection. (500 feet) (0.10 miles).
- Construct new 2 lane rural section from Union Chapel Road to new bridge over Buck Creek. (1,700 feet) (0.32 miles).
- Construct new 2 lane rural section bridge over Buck Creek. ( 1,000 feet) ( 0.19 miles).
- Construct new 2 lane rural section from new bridge over Buck Creek to S.R. 11. (11,600 feet) ( 2.20 miles).
Project Termini: From S.R. 135 (Minor Arterial) to S.R. 11 (Major Collector).
Current Functional Classification: Major Collector
Current ADT: 736 v.p.d
Benefits: - New east-west roadway in southern portion of the county to improve traffic flow with a safer facility.
- Connect S.R. 135 (Minor Arterial) to S.R. 11.
- Improve existing Major Collector and traffic flow with a safer facility.
- Realign horizontal and vertical curves to improve sight distance.


## East-West Roadway in Southern Portion of the County (Continued) (see Figure 13)

Two (2) separate options for this project were investigated. Option 1 is the Watson Road Extension Project and is currently being studied by PDR Engineers, Inc. and is discussed on the previous page. Option 2 is the Lake Road/Buck Creek Valley Road Project as discussed below.

## Option 2 (Lake Road/Buck Creek Valley Road)

Project Location: From S.R. 135 to New Middletown-Elizabeth Road.
Project Length: $\quad 31,800$ feet ( 6.02 miles)
Project Description: - Reconstruct new 2 lane rural section from S.R. 135 to S.R. 337. ( 19,100 feet) ( 3.62 miles).

- Realign Lake Road and Buck Creek Valley Road intersection. ( 250 feet) ( 0.05 miles).
- Realign Lake Road and S.R. 337 intersection. (250 feet) ( 0.05 miles).
- Reconstruct new 2 lane rural section from S.R. 337 to new bridge over Buck Creek. (5,720 feet) ( 1.08 miles).
- Construct new 2 lane rural section bridge over Buck Creek. ( 800 feet) ( 0.15 miles).
- Reconstruct new 2 lane rural section from new bridge over Buck Creek to New Middletown-Elizabeth Road. ( 6,180 feet) ( 1.17 miles).

Project Termini: From S.R. 135 (Minor Arterial) to S.R. 337 (Major Collector) to New Middletown-Elizabeth Road (Major Collector).

Current Functional Classification: Local Road
Current ADT: 344 v.p.d

Benefits:

- New east-west roadway in southern portion of the county to improve traffic flow with a safer facility.
- Connect S.R. 135 (Minor Arterial) to S.R. 337 (Major Collector) to New Middletown-Elizabeth Road (Major Collector).
- Improve intersection alignment at both Buck Creek Valley Road and S.R. 337 intersections with Lake Road.
- Realign horizontal and vertical curves to improve sight distance.


## FIGURE 13



Shiloh Road/Fogel Road (see Figure 14)
Project Location: From S.R. 337 to Corydon-New Middletown Road at New Middletown.

Project Length: $\quad 11,700$ feet ( 2.22 miles)
Project Description: - Reconstruct 2-lane rural section from S.R. 337 to Corydon-New Middletown Road. Realign approximately 2,000 feet ( 0.38 miles) and follow existing alignment for approximately 9,700 feet ( 1.84 miles).

Project Termini: Connect S.R. 337 (Major Collector) to Corydon-New Middletown Road (Major Collector) at New Middletown.

Current Functional Classification: Local Road - To be reclassified as a Major Collector.

Current ADT: $\quad 1,764$ v.p.d
Benefits: - Connect S.R. 337 (Major Collector) to Corydon-New Middletown Road (Major Collector) at New Middletown.

- Improve access to southern portion of Corydon.
- Realign horizontal and vertical curves to improve sight distance.
- Improved traffic flow and safer facility.


## FIGURE 14



## New Connector Road Between S.R. 135 and Big Indian Road (see Figure 15)

Project Location: From the intersection of S.R. 135 and Landmark Avenue, east over the Indian Creek to Big Indian Road.

Project Length: $\quad 5,705$ feet ( 1.08 miles)
Project Description: - Improve S.R. 135 and Landmark Avenue intersection east approach with addition of turn lanes (urban section) and updated traffic signal ( 950 feet) ( 0.18 miles).

- At grade crossing for Louisville-New Albany and Corydon Railroad.
- Construct new 2-lane bridge over Indian Creek (1,575 feet) ( 0.30 miles).
- Construct new 2-lane rural section from new bridge over Indian Creek to project termini at Big Indian Road (2,120 feet) ( 0.40 miles).
- Realign section of Big Indian Road to tie into new Connector roadway ( 1,060 feet) ( 0.20 miles).

Project Termini: Connect S.R. 135 (Minor Arterial) to Big Indian Road (Major Collector following reclassification).

Current Functional Classification: Big Indian Road: Local Road - To be reclassified as a Major Collector.
New roadway not classified - to be classified as a Major Collector.

Current ADT: 1000 v.p.d on Big Indian Road.
Benefits: - Connect S.R. 135 (Minor Arterial) and Big Indian Road (Major Collector following reclassification).

- Improve access to and from S.R. 135 and I-64 from eastern portions of Corydon.
- Relieve congestion in eastern portion of Corydon.
- Provide access to areas of development east of Corydon.
- Improve traffic flow on eastern side of Corydon.
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## Corydon-New Middletown Road and New Middletown-Elizabeth Road (see Figure 16)

This project has been separated into phases and is currently being studied by PDR Engineers, Inc. A portion of the information contained below was provided by PDR Engineers, Inc.

Project Location: From S.R. 62 to New Middletown and from New Middletown to Elizabeth.

Project Length: $\quad 55,340$ feet ( 10.48 miles)
Project Description: - Roadway essentially follows existing roadway with a few exceptions.

- Realign the intersection of Corydon-New Middletown Road and Smith Hill Road.
- Realign the $2-90^{\circ}$ Curves at the Corydon-New Middletown Road and Fogel Road intersection.
- Possible bypass at New Middletown.
- Little Indian Creek and Buck Creek bridges to be reused with minor renovations required to upgrade structures.

Project Termini: Connect S.R. 62 (Major Collector) to New Middletown and New Middletown to Elizabeth.

Current Functional Classification: Major Collector
Current ADT: 2377 v.p.d

Benefits: - Upgrade of existing Major Collector to improve traffic flow and provide a safer facility.

- Improve horizontal and vertical alignment along length of roadway.
- Improve Corydon-New Middletown Road and Smith Hill Road intersection.
- Improve traffic flow at New Middletown with possible bypass.
- Improve access to Corydon from southeastern portion of Harrison County.


## FIGURE 16



Quarry Road (see Figure 17)
Project Location: From North Gethsemane Road to S.R. 337.
Project Length: $\quad 5,065$ feet ( 0.96 miles)
Project length reduced to 3,720 feet ( 0.70 miles) if Quarry Road Project follows proposed I-64 and S.R. 337 interchange project and Quarry Road intersection with S.R. 337 realignment.

Project Description: - New 2 lane rural roadway and R/W from North Gethsemane Road to end of existing Quarry Road (2,075 feet) ( 0.39 miles).

- Reconstruct new 2 lane rural section and R/W from existing end of Quarry Road to S.R. 337 (2,990 feet) ( 0.57 miles).

Project Termini: Connect North Gethsemane Road (Local Road - to be reclassified as a Minor/Major Collector) to S.R. 337 (Major Collector).

Current Functional Classification: Local Road - To be reclassified as a Major Collector.
New roadway not classified - to be classified as a Major Collector.

Current ADT: 365 v.p.d
Benefits:

- Connect North Gethsemane Road (Minor/Major Collector following reclassification) to S.R. 337 (Major Collector).
- Provide access to S.R. 337 from the northwest.
- Improved traffic flow and safer facility with wider, 2-way traffic.
- May need to make improvements to and upgrade the functional classification of North Gethsemane Road also.


## FIGURE 17



## Potential Locally Funded Transportation Improvement Projects

The Harrison County Transportation Plan includes improvements funded as Federal Aid Projects and improvements funded with all local money. The Federal Aid Projects include ten (10) specific projects, as shown in Figure 7 and listed in Table 4. These projects were designed to improve the safety of the motoring public, reduce accidents, improve capacity, accommodate existing and future traffic flow, and meet future land use needs. These roadways are currently classified as or will be reclassified to Major Collectors on the State Functional Classification System. Being classified as Major Collectors makes the roadways eligible for county officials to seek Federal Funding for $80 \%$ of the construction and construction engineering/inspection costs. These roadways are typically viewed as more vital parts of the local transportation system.

The Transportation Plan has also identified projects funded with local money that would improve the safety of an existing roadway facility. These roadways are generally classified lower than a Major Collector and, therefore, are not eligible for Federal Funding for construction and construction engineering/inspection costs. Improvements to these roadways would be funded utilizing local funds. However, INDOT has some Hazard Elimination funding available for "spot" repairs to a roadway. These projects might include an improvement such as pavement widening, installation of shoulders, the straightening of a curve or the removal of a hill to improve sight distance. Many of these roadways are those that experience a high incidence of accidents, as shown in Figure 1. These projects are listed below and shown on Figure 18. They are not in any priority order.

1. Cline Road from Quarry Road to Sheri Lane.
2. Clover Valley Road.
a. Phase I - From S.R. 337 to Davis Mill Road.
b. Phase II - From Davis Mill Road to S.R. 64.
3. Corydon-Ramsey Road from Quarry Road to S.R. 64.
4. Corydon Ridge Road from Corydon to the Lanesville Interchange.
5. Relocation of Corydon Ridge Road and Crandall-Lanesville Road south of Lanesville Interchange.
a. According to the Lanesville Interchange Master Plan, this should be completed prior to allowing significant development.
6. Crandall-Lanesville Road from S.R. 62 to I-64.
7. Heidelberg Road from Fairview Church Road to S.R. 135.
8. New Amsterdam and Heth Washington Road from New Amsterdam to S.R. 135.
9. Quarry Road from S.R. 337 to S.R. 135.
10. River Road from New Amsterdam to Mauckport.
11. West Bradford Road from S.R. 135 to North Bradford Road.
12. Relocation of Georgetown-Lanesville Road (Wissman Dr.) and Crandall-Lanesville Road north of Lanesville Interchange.

The Transportation Plan has also identified several roadways that could become more important in the longer-range Transportation Plan, a period of time 20 years or more into the future. These potential projects are not warranted in the 10 to 20 year time frame covered by this Transportation Plan but could become warranted in the distant future, as Harrison County continues to develop industrially, commercially and residentially. These projects are listed below and shown on Figure 19. They are not in any priority order.

1. Fredericksburg Road from S.R. 64 to S.R. 150.
2. Bird Trail Road/North Road from S.R. 64 to S.R. 150.
3. Corydon-Ramsey Road from S.R. 64 to S.R. 150.
4. New Roadway from the Lanesville Interchange, to the southeast, to S.R. 11 near the Casino.
5. West Corydon By-Pass. This roadway would begin at the above-mentioned connector spur connecting realigned S.R. 337, at the proposed I-64 and S.R. 337 interchange, to S.R. 62 to the south. It would proceed south and then southeast, on the southwest side of Corydon, and connect to S.R. 135 just south of Corydon.
6. Milltown-Frenchtown Road from Milltown to S.R. 337.
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## ROADWAY CLASSIFICATIONS \& STANDARDS

At the present time, Harrison County has a Comprehensive Plan that was adopted by the Harrison County Commissioners in 1996. They do not have a Thoroughfare Plan or Construction Regulations. In 2002, the Harrison County Board of Commissioners contracted with Bernardin, Lochmueller \& Associates, Inc. (BLA), to prepare a Transportation Plan and to update the Functional Classification Map for Harrison County. Upon completion of the Transportation Plan and the Functional Classification Map update, Road Construction Regulations will be developed, the Subdivision Ordinance will be updated, the Comprehensive Plan will be updated and a Thoroughfare Plan will be developed. The Thoroughfare Plan and Construction Regulations should be adopted as amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and should be included in the updated Subdivision Control Ordinance. The existing Subdivision Control Ordinance, in Section 4.1(g), states that all subdivision plats shall comply with the County Thoroughfare Plan, although there currently is no such plan.

At the present time, the Harrison County Subdivision Control Ordinance, Ordinance No. 1995-6, has established classifications for streets and highways with right-of-way widths that are measured from lot line to lot line. These right-of-way widths by roadway classification are shown in Table 6 below. The Subdivision Control Ordinance has also established minimum pavement widths for subdivision streets. These widths are twenty-two (22) feet with six (6) foot shoulders. Where roll curbs are installed, the minimum width from face-to-face of curb is eighteen (18) feet. These minimum pavement widths are for all roadways. They do not take into account the functional classification of the roadway. The Subdivision Control Ordinance shall be updated to reflect pavement widths, setbacks, right-of-way requirements, etc. as detailed in the Thoroughfare Plan.

| ROADWAY TYPE | MINIMUM DEDICATED RIGHT-OF-WAY |
| :--- | :---: |
| Arterial | 80 feet |
| Collector | 70 feet |
| Local Road (Rural) | 60 feet |
| Local Road (Urban) <br> Curb and gutter and storm sewers. | 50 feet |

Source: Harrison County Subdivision Control Ordinance
Table 6 - Existing Harrison County Street Classifications and Right-of-Way Widths

The Thoroughfare Plan will identify the future roadway system supporting the Future Land Use Plan that is a part of the Harrison County Comprehensive Plan. The Thoroughfare Plan will place the major streets and highways of the county into functional classes. These classes represent the purpose the road serves. In turn, each functional class will have a typical right-of-way width and design typical cross-section that will specify the number of lanes, pavement width, setbacks, etc. The public or private sectors will use the Thoroughfare Plan in the development review process to reserve right-of-way for future roadway improvements and to guide the design of roadway improvements. Examples of "draft" typical cross-sections by roadway functional classification, that will be completed and included in the Thoroughfare Plan, are contained in Appendix A. Table 7 summarizes the "draft" minimum dedicated right-of-way width by roadway classification that will be reviewed and included in the Thoroughfare Plan.

| ROADWAY TYPE | MINIMUM DEDICATED RIGHT-OF-WAY |
| :--- | :---: |
| Arterial | 100 feet |
| Collector | 100 feet |
| Local Road (Rural) | 60 feet |
| Local Road (Urban) <br> Curb and gutter and storm sewers. | 55 feet |

Source: BLA

Table 7 - "Draft" Harrison County Street Classifications and Right-of-Way Widths

The Road Construction Regulations will provide the developer with county approved standards for design and plan development, construction specifications and construction standard drawings. This will assist county officials and developers in obtaining consistency in newly developing areas and will provide developers with county requirements in the early planning stages of a new development.

APPENDIX A
$\qquad$


Insert Appendix A

APPENDIX B


|  |  |  | SR-11 <br> IR-22 <br> IR-30 (Wiseman Rd.) <br> IR-157 (South Pleasant Rd.) IR-36 (Shitoh Rd.) Country Club Rd.(Corydon) South Harrison Dr.(Corydon) Ridley St.(Corydon) Capitol Ave.(Corydon) SR-62 (Jct.East) <br> (SR-337 follows over SR-62) <br> SR-62 (Jct.West) <br> High St.(Corydon) <br> Wyandotte Ave.(Corydon) <br> IR-433 (Y-Conn to SR-135) SR-135 <br> Harrison Poolside Dr. <br> IR-39 (Corydon-Ramsey Rd.) <br> IR-50 (Quarry Rd.) <br> IR-54 (Loudens Chapel Rd.) IR-246 (Frenchtown Rd.) IR-204 (Wetzel Rd.) <br> SR-64 <br> SR-62 <br> Harrison State Forest |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INDIANA DEPARTMENT 2000 ANNUAL AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC HAROF TRANSPORTATION |  |  |  | 31 |

FLOYD



APPENDIX C
Harrison County

## 1998 Statistics

## 1998 Fatal Crashes

 by Month|  <br> Incapacitating <br> Injuries, <br> Restrained, |  <br> Incapacitating <br> Injuries, |  <br> Incapacitating <br> Restrained, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Ages | Restrained, |  |
| Age0-15 | Age16-20 |  |
| $38.09 \%$ | $36.67 \%$ | $34.84 \%$ |

February 9, 2001

| Month of <br> Crash | Number of <br> Fatal Crashes | Number of <br> Fatalities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| January | 1 | 1 |
| February | 0 | 0 |
| March | 1 | 2 |
| April | 0 | 0 |
| May | 0 | 0 |
| June | 2 | 2 |
| July | 1 | 1 |
| August | 0 | 0 |
| September | 1 | 1 |
| October | 4 | 4 |
| November | 0 | 0 |
| December | 1 | 1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ |

Population and Licensed Drivers

| Age Group | Total County Population | Licensed Drivers | \% of <br> Population with Valid Licenses | Number of Drivers in Crashes by Age | \% Licensed <br> Drivers <br> Involved in <br> Crashes by <br> Age Group |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0-5 | 2,803 |  | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| 6-10 | 2,725 |  | N/A | 1 | N/A |
| 11-15 | 2,803 |  | N/A | 3 | N/A |
| 16-17 | 1,171 | 851 | 72.7\% | 196 | 23.0\% |
| 18-20 | 1,222 | 1,536 | 125.7\% | 258 | 16.8\% |
| 21-24 | 1,420 | 1,742 | 122.7\% | 169 | 9.7\% |
| 25-34 | 4,735 | 4,573 | 96.6\% | 376 | 8.2\% |
| 35-44 | 6,097 | 5,827 | 95.6\% | 354 | 6.1\% |
| 45-54 | 4,671 | 4,817 | 103.1\% | 222 | 4.6\% |
| 55-64 | 3,011 | 3,085 | 102.5\% | 126 | 4.1\% |
| 65-74 | 2,124 | 2,009 | 94.6\% | 79 | 3.9\% |
| 75+ | 1,948 | 1,074 | 55.1\% | 60 | 5.6\% |
|  |  |  |  | 44 |  |
| Total | 34,730 | 25,514 | 73.5\% | 1,888 | 7.4\% |

1998 Municipality Crash Data, Total Crash and Alcohol-Related Crash Losses

| Revised 2/2001 |  |  |  | Total Crashes |  |  |  |  |  |  | Alcohol-Related Crashes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total \# Crashes | Fatal |  | Personal Injury |  | Property Damage |  | Cost | Total |  |  |  | Fatal |  | Personal Injury |  | Property Damage |  |
| Municipality | Total Cost | Killed | Injured |  | \#Fatal Crashes | $\begin{array}{r} \% \text { of } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { \#PI } \\ \text { Crashes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { \#PD } \\ \text { Crashes } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ |  | Killed In |  | Total \# Crashes | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | \# Fatal Crashes | $\% \text { of }$ Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { \# PI } \\ \text { Crashes } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { \#PD } \\ \text { Crashes } \end{array}$ | $\%$ of Total |
| Corydon | \$2,000,478 | 1 | 45 | 174 | 1 | 1\% | 29 | 17\% | 144 | 83\% | \$24,767 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 3 | 2\% |
| Crandall | \$16,253 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0\% |  | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | \$0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | --- | 0 | 0\% | 0 | ---- |
| Elizabeth | \$47,831 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 29\% | 5 | 71\% | \$17,956 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 29\% | 0 | $\cdots$ | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 20\% |
| Laconia | \$34,209 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0\% |  | 67\% | 1 | 33\% | \$0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | $\cdots$ | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Lanesville | \$41,794 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 10\% | 9 | 90\% | \$0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | $\cdots$ | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Mauckport | \$1,703 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 100\% | \$0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | $\cdots$ | 0 | $\cdots$ | 0 | 0\% |
| Milltown | \$19,659 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 50\% | \$0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | $\cdots$ | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| New Middletown | \$29,875 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 17\% | 5 | 83\% | \$0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | $\cdots$ | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Palmyra | \$2,579,294 | 3 | 7 | 32 | 2 | 6\% | 5 | 16\% | 25 | 78\% | \$21,361 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 20\% | 2 | 8\% |
| Rural | \$14,620,340 | 8 | 392 | 1,011 | 8 | 1\% | 253 | 25\% | 750 | 74\% | \$1,534,562 | 1 | 42 | 52 | 5\% | 1 | 13\% | 29 | 11\% | 22 | 3\% |
| Totals | \$19,391,436 | 12 | 452 | 1,247 | 11 | 1\% | 295 | 17\% | 941 | 83\% | \$1,598,646 | 1 | 45 | 61 | 5\% | 1 | 9\% | 32 | 11\% | 28 | 3\% |



1999 Municipality Grash Data, Total Grash and Alcohol-Related Grash Losses

| Municipality | Total Crashes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Alcohol-Related Crashes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Cost | Killed | Injured | Total \# <br> Crashes | Fatal |  | Personal Injury |  | Property Damage |  | Cost | Killed | Injured | Total |  | Fatal |  | Personal Injury |  | Property Damage |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | \# Fatal Crashes | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \% \text { of } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \# PI } \\ \text { Crashes } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \% \text { of } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# PD } \\ \text { Crashes } \end{gathered}$ | \% of Total |  |  |  | Total \# Crashes | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \% \text { of } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \# Fatal <br> Crashes | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \% \text { of } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \# PI } \\ \text { Crashes } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \% \text { of } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# PD } \\ \text { Crashes } \end{gathered}$ | $\% \text { of }$ Total |
| Corydon | \$1,195,584 | 0 | 40 | 165 | 0 | 0\% | 29 | 18\% | 136 | 82\% | \$1,851 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1\% | 0 | --- | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 1\% |
| Crandall | \$3,702 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 100\% | \$0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | --- | 0 | --- | 0 | 0\% |
| Elizabeth | \$53,679 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 15 | 100\% | \$3,702 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7\% | 0 | -- | 0 | --- | 1 | 7\% |
| Laconia | \$3,702 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 100\% | \$0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | 0\% |
| Lanesville | \$102,159 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 33\% | 8 | 67\% | \$0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | -- | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Mauckport | \$7,404 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 100\% | \$3,702 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 1 | 50\% |
| Milltown | \$7,404 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 100\% | \$0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | -- | 0 | --- | 0 | 0\% |
| New Middletown | \$3,702 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 100\% | \$0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | 0\% |
| Palmyra | \$134,640 | 0 | 5 | 18 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 22\% | 14 | 78\% | \$17,673 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6\% | 0 | -- | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Rural | \$12,226,219 | 4 | 378 | 1,029 | 4 | 0\% | 242 | 24\% | 783 | 76\% | \$955,002 | 0 | 51 | 53 | 5\% | 0 | 0\% | 31 | 13\% | 22 | 3\% |
| Totals | \$13,738,195 | 4 | 427 | 1,247 | 4 | 0\% | 279 | 18\% | 964 | 82\% | \$981,930 | 0 | 52 | 57 | 5\% | 0 | 0\% | 32 | 11\% | 25 | 3\% |

Funding for this publication is provided by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration through the Indiana Governor's Council on Impaired and Dangerous Driving, a division of the Criminal Justice Institute. Information supplied herein is believed to be accurate and complete at the time of publication. Data elements and graphs presented are compiled using crash information obtained from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. This publication was created on behalf of the Governor's Council on Impaired and Dangerous Driving by Purdue University's Center for the Advancement of Transportation Safety.
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## APPENDIX E

## INDOT 2000-2025 LONG RANGE PLAN



INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING, AND ENGINEERING
LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING SECTION


## Indiana Interstate Interchange Study

A major element in the development of an efficient statewide system of transportation is the provision for Interstate interchanges which operate at an acceptable level of service for traffic operations, operate safely, and are up to date relative to today's geometric standards. To address these issues, INDOT has prepared the Indiana Interstate Interchange Planning Study. This study updated the previous Interstate Interchange Evaluation Study undertaken by INDOT in the late 1980s. The interchange study has developed improvement recommendations and priorities for the nearly 250 existing interchanges on the Interstate System, plus evaluated the feasibility and need for 11 new interchange locations. The recommendations of this interchange study provide the foundation for the interchange improvement program in terms of interchange modifications and new interchange development. All Interstate interchanges are evaluated with the exception of the Indiana Toll Road interchanges, which are analyzed in a separate INDOT process. The interchange study evaluates the potential interchange improvement needs by studying the following factors: (1) accident frequency and severity, (2) future traffic volumes and interchange level of service (congestion), (3) geometric deficiencies and, (4) pavement and bridge conditions. Each interchange is placed into an analysis category. Interchanges which are under active INDOT improvement study or which have current improvement projects underway are included only in the inventory phase of the study. Interchanges in rural areas with no significant new development occurring in the area receive only limited study. The majority of study resources are directed toward interchanges located in areas with rapidly increasing development pressure and higher traffic volumes.

The interchange evaluation study has just been completed. The final report recommendations include a list of improvements and associated estimated costs per interchange. As noted above, the report's recommendations will drive our interchange modification and new interchange construction program for the next 5 to 7 years and beyond. A preliminary estimate of identified interchange improvement needs has been included in the project listings in Chapter 11. This initial estimate will be refined over the next several years into more specific project identifications. This estimate of interchange improvement needs allows for the establishment of a project category for each district's interchange program plus evaluation of fiscal constraint issues.

Figure 9-5 Interchange Locations


Potential New Interchange Summary Index

| Location |  |  | Justification/Benefit |  |  | Apparent Feasibility |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Interchange | County | Interstate System | Local System | Economic Devt | FHWA Rqmis | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline \text { A } & \text { Env } \\ \text { is } \\ \text { (NEPA) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Plan } \\ & \text { MPO } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{cc}\text { Support } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Economic } \\ \text { Devt }\end{array} \\ \text { Local } & \end{array}$ |
| $1-64$ | Gethsemane Rd | Harrison | X | X | included | Yes Other: | Yes <br> Additional st and preferre |  |  |
|  | CR750N | Johnson | X | x | included | Yes* Other: | Yes <br> Part of Green /MPO review | TBD <br> ood Plan <br> pending |  |
|  | SR 14 | Jasper |  | X | X | Yes Other: | Yes <br> Serves emerg strong multi |  | Yes Exist/New dustry; |
| 1-65 | 101st Avenue | Lake | X | X | included | Yes* Other: | Yes <br> Lake County 109th Avenu | Yes <br> lan Comn location | No New Nsion prefers |
|  | 126th Street | Hamilton |  |  | included | Yes* Other: | Yes Suggested by | No Fishers/M | No New O review pending |
|  | Gump/Hursh Rd | Allen | x | x | No | Yes Other: | Yes MPO plan sho | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { ws } 2010 \mathrm{c} \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\text { nstruction }}{\text { Yes }} \text { Restricted }$ |
|  | German Church Rd | Marion | X | X |  | Yes Other: | Yes <br> MPO plan sho | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { ws } 2007 \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & 015 \text { construction } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | SR 47 | Montgomery |  | X | X | Yes Other: in | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { intended to im } \end{gathered}$ | rove acce | No Exist/New Nor local businesses |
|  | Michigan Rd | Shelby | -- | -- | -- | Yes Other: | TBD <br> Local plans Fairland inte | ing chan hange in | No <br> Improve <br> tead |
|  | County Line Rd | LaPorte/Porter |  | x | x | Yes Other: | Yes <br> Listed by MP serves exist | No but not g comm | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes Exist } \\ & \text { inst feasible plan; } \\ & \text { cial } \end{aligned}$ |
| $1-465$ | Cooper Rd | Boone | X |  | No | Yes Other: | TBD <br> Adopted in B MPO review | No <br> one Coun ending | Yes Restricted and Zionsville Plans |

*INDOT rural interchange spacing criteria of 5KM (3.11 mi) not met at this location

Priorities - Interstate System
1-69 \& Gump/Hursh Rd
1-70 \& German Church Rd
1-465 \& Cooper Rd (tentative)
$1-65 \&$ 101st Ave (tentative) $1-64$ \& Gethsemane Rd (tentative)

Priorities - Local System
1-69 \& Gump/Hursh Rd 1-6465 \& Cooper Rd
1-65 \& CR750N (tentative)
$1-65 \&$ 101st Ave (tentative) 1-64 \& Gethsemane Rd (tentative)

Priorities - Economic Development
1-65 \& SR 14
1-94 \& County Line Rd I-74 \& SR 47 (tentative)

Additional study needed for consensus/ustification

1-465 \& Cooper Rd - MPO plan support needed
1-94 \& County Line Rd - MPO plan support needed
1-65 \& 101st Ave - MPO/locl consensus needed
1-74 \& SR 47 - Local plan support needed
1-64 \& Gethsemane Rd - Local plan support needed 1-65 \& CR 750N - MPO \& Local plan support needed 1-69 \& 126th St - MPO \& Local plan support needed

## APPENDIX F

Indiana Department of Transportation's
STATEWIDE
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

FY 2002 - FY 2004

"Proudly Moving Indiana.... Into the $21^{\text {st }}$ Century."

Prepared November, 2001

GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS
(for project summary purposes only)


This document is divided into geographic regions for project summary purposes only. At past public meetings, several comments were received that providing a more regional summary would make the program easier to understand. This is our first step to implementing that suggestion. Now we would now like to hear your opinion about these boundaries.

Your suggestions about what the regional boundaries should be would be appreciated. Please let us know. These boundaries are to help make this document better, and so are subject to change based upon the ideas and expectations we receive from you, the public. Thank you in advance for your help.

| TOTAL COSTS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY 2002 | FY 2003 | FY 2004 |
| 3,108 |  |  |
| 10 | 11 |  |
| 60 | 150 |  |
| 50 | 80 |  |
| 90 | 80 |  |
|  |  | 2,010 |
| 90 | 50 |  |
| 21,435 |  |  |
| 33,715 |  |  |
| 1,708 |  |  |
| 700 |  | 700 |
|  |  | 700 |





| TOTAL COSTS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY 2002 | FY 2003 | FY 2004 |

 ल゙
in


 Program



APPENDIX G
$\frac{\text { CRANDALL-LANESVILLE ROAD }}{\text { (2002 Dollars) }}$


| CONSTRUCTION COSTS | LENGTH (miles) | NO. <br> LANES OR SIDES | COST per MILE <br> (\$) | TOTAL COST <br> (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Added Lanes (3 lanes at interchange) | 0.49 | 5 | \$2,250,000.00 | \$1,102,500.00 |
| Overlay/Upgrade Exist. Pvmt. (2 lanes at interchange) | 0.49 | 2 | \$362,500.00 | \$177,625.00 |
| 3-Lane Rural Section | 1.82 | 3 | \$2,250,000.00 | \$4,095,000.00 |
| New Bridge over Rail Road (SFT) | 15,000.00 | 3 | \$65.00 | \$975,000.00 |
| New Signal at S.R. 62 |  |  |  | \$80,000.00 |
| New Signal at I-64 Ramp |  |  |  | \$80,000.00 |
| Overhead Signing for TWLTL | 2.31 |  | \$60,000.00 | \$138,600.00 |
| Traffic Maintenance | 0.49 |  | \$265,000.00 | \$129,850.00 |
| Traffic Signs | 2.31 |  | \$25,000.00 | \$57,750.00 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  | \$6,836,325.00 |
| Contingency (15\%) |  |  |  | \$1,025,448.75 |
| Inflation (15\%) |  |  |  | \$1,179,266.06 |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST |  |  |  | \$9,041,039.81 |

Inflation of $15 \%$ necessary to correct 1997 costs per mile used in calculations to 2002 dollars.
CORYDON-RAMSEY ROAD ${ }^{(2002}$ Dolars)

| CONSTRUCTION COST | $\$ 9,300,000.00$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| ENVIRONMENTAL/SURVEY/DESIGN COST | $\$ 911,400.00$ |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY COST | $\$ 3,301,000.00$ |
| CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING/INSPECTION COST | $\$ 1,395,000.00$ |
| PROJECT COST | $\$ 14,907,400.00$ |

See Construction Cost Calculations Below.
Environmental/Design Costs are Assumed to be a fixed $9 \%$ of the Construction Cost and Survey Costs are $\$ 40,000$ per mile See Appendix H for Right-of-Way Cost Calculations.

| CONSTRUCTION COSTS | LENGTH <br> (miles) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { NO. } \\ \hline \text { LANES OR } \\ \text { SIDES } \end{array}$ | COST per MILE <br> (\$) | TOTAL COST <br> (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Improvement | 0.08 | 3 | \$800,000.00 | \$64,000.00 |
| New Signal at S.R. 62 |  |  |  | \$80,000.00 |
| New Signal at S.R. 337 |  |  |  | \$80,000.00 |
| 3-Lane Urban Section | 0.86 | 3 | \$1,875,000.00 | \$1,612,500.00 |
| Storm Sewers | 0.86 | 3 | \$100,000.00 | \$258,000.00 |
| Curb and Gutter | 0.86 | 3 | \$110,000.00 | \$94,600.00 |
| Sidewalks (2 sides) | 0.86 | 2 | \$70,000.00 | \$120,400.00 |
| 5-Lane Urban Section | 0.46 | 5 | \$3,000,000.00 | \$1,380,000.00 |
| Storm Sewers | 0.46 | 5 | \$100,000.00 | \$230,000.00 |
| Curb and Gutter | 0.46 | 5 | \$110,000.00 | \$50,600.00 |
| Sidewalks (2 sides) | 0.46 | 2 | \$70,000.00 | \$64,400.00 |
| 5-Lane Rural Section | 0.42 | 5 | \$2,500,000.00 | \$1,050,000.00 |
| I-64 Bridge Reconstruction (SFT) | 20,000.00 | 5 | \$65.00 | \$1,300,000.00 |
| Traffic Maintenance | 1.86 |  | \$265,000.00 | \$492,900.00 |
| Overhead Signing for TWLTL | 1.86 |  | \$60,000.00 | \$111,600.00 |
| Traffic Signs | 1.86 |  | \$25,000.00 | \$46,500.00 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  | \$7,035,500.00 |
| Contingency (15\%) |  |  |  | \$1,055,325.00 |
| Inflation (15\%) |  |  |  | \$1,213,623.75 |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST |  |  |  | \$9,304,448.75 |

$\xrightarrow[(\text { CONNECTOR FROM S.R. } 337 \text { TO CORYDON-RAMSEY ROAD (OPTION 1) }]{\text { (2002 }}$
Environmental/Design Costs are Assumed to be a fixed $9 \%$ of the Construction Cost and Survey Costs are $\$ 40,000$ per mile
See Construction Cost Calculations Below. Construction Engineering/Inspection Costs are Assumed to be a fixed 15\% of the Construction Cost See Appendix H for Right-of-Way Cost Calculations.
NOTES:
CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Inflation of $15 \%$ necessary to correct 1997 costs per mile used in calculations to 2002 dollars.
NOTE:

Harrison County
CONNECTOR FROM S.R. 337 TO CORYDON-RAMSEY ROAD (OPTION 2) (2002 Dollars)
Preferred Option if Proposed S.R. 337 Interchange is Constructed


NOTES:
See Construction Cost Calculations Below.
Environmental/Design Costs are Assumed to be a fixed $9 \%$ of the Construction Cost and Survey Costs are $\$ 40,000$ per mile Construction Engineering/Inspection Costs are Assumed to be a fixed 15\% of the Construction Cost See Appendix H for Right-of-Way Cost Calculations.


Inflation of $15 \%$ necessary to correct 1997 costs per mile used in calculations to 2002 dollars.
HEIDELBERG ROAD (2002 Dollars)


| CONSTRUCTION COSTS | LENGTH <br> (miles) | NO. <br> LANES OR SIDES | COST per MILE <br> (\$) | TOTAL COST <br> (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Improvement | 0.15 | 3 | \$800,000.00 | \$120,000.00 |
| 2-Lane Rural Section | 1.00 | 2 | \$1,500,000.00 | \$1,500,000.00 |
| 3-Lane Urban Section | 0.08 | 3 | \$1,875,000.00 | \$150,000.00 |
| Storm Sewers | 0.08 | 3 | \$100,000.00 | \$24,000.00 |
| Curb and Gutter | 0.08 | 3 | \$110,000.00 | \$8,800.00 |
| Sidewalks (2 sides) | 0.08 | 2 | \$70,000.00 | \$11,200.00 |
| Traffic Maintenance | 1.23 |  | \$265,000.00 | \$325,950.00 |
| Traffic Signs | 1.23 |  | \$25,000.00 | \$30,750.00 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  | \$2,170,700.00 |
| Contingency (15\%) |  |  |  | \$325,605.00 |
| Inflation (15\%) |  |  |  | \$374,445.75 |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST |  |  |  | \$2,870,750.75 |

Inflation of $15 \%$ necessary to correct 1997 costs per mile used in calculations to 2002 dollars.
LAKE ROAD/BUCK CREEK VALLEY ROAD
(2002 Dollars)
Environmental/Design Costs are Assumed to be a fixed $9 \%$ of the Construction Cost and Survey Costs are $\$ 40,000$ per mile Construction Engineering/Inspection Costs are Assumed to be a fixed $15 \%$ of the Construction Cost See Appendix H for Right-of-Way Cost Calculations.
NOTES:

| CONSTRUCTION COSTS | LENGTH <br> (miles) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { NO. } \\ \text { LANES OR } \\ \text { SIDES } \end{array}$ | COST per MILE <br> (\$) | TOTAL COST (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Improvement (2-intersections) | 0.10 | 3 | \$800,000.00 | \$80,000.00 |
| 2-Lane Rural Section (SR 135 to SR 337) | 3.62 | 2 | \$1,500,000.00 | \$5,430,000.00 |
| 2-Lane Rural Section (SR 337 to Buck Creek) | 1.08 | 2 | \$1,500,000.00 | \$1,620,000.00 |
| I-64 Bridge Reconstruction (SFT) | 35,200.00 | 2 | \$65.00 | \$2,288,000.00 |
| 2-Lane Rural Section (Buck Creek to end of proj.) | 1.17 | 2 | \$1,500,000.00 | \$1,755,000.00 |
| Traffic Maintenance |  |  |  | \$150,000.00 |
| Traffic Signs | 6.02 |  | \$25,000.00 | \$150,500.00 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  | \$11,473,500.00 |
| Contingency (15\%) |  |  |  | \$1,721,025.00 |
| Inflation (15\%) |  |  |  | \$1,979,178.75 |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST |  |  |  | \$15,173,703.75 |



## NOTE:

$\underset{(2020 \text { Dollars) }}{\text { WATSON ROAD }}$
$\frac{\text { SHILOH ROAD AND FOGEL ROAD }}{\text { (2002 Dollars) }}$
CONSTRUCTION COST
ENVIRONMENTAL/SURVEY/DESIGN COST
RIGHT-OF-WAY COST

| CONSTRUCTION COST | $\$ 5,300,000.00$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| ENVIRONMENTAL/SURVEY/DESIGN COST | $\$ 56,800.00$ |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY COST | $\$ 1,402,500.00$ |
| CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING/INSPECTION COST | $\$ 795,000.00$ |
| PROJECT COST | $\$ 8,063,300.00$ |

## NOTES:

See Construction Cost Calculations Below.
Environmental/Design Costs are Assumed to be a fixed $9 \%$ of the Construction Cost and Survey Costs are $\$ 40,000$ per mile Construction Engineering/Inspection Costs are Assumed to be a fixed $15 \%$ of the Construction Cost See Appendix H for Right-of-Way Cost Calculations.

> CONSTRUCTION COSTS

## TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST

NOTE:
NEW CONNECTOR ROAD BETWEEN S.R. 135 AND BIG INDIAN ROAD (2002 Dollars)

See Construction Cost Calculations Below.
Environmental/Design Costs are Assumed to be a fixed $9 \%$ of the Construction Cost and Survey Costs are $\$ 40,000$ per mile Construction Engineering/Inspection Costs are Assumed to be a fixed 15\% of the Construction Cost See Appendix H for Right-of-Way Cost Calculations.
NOTES:
CONSTRUCTION COSTS
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST
Inflation of $15 \%$ necessary to correct 1997 costs per mile used in calculations to 2002 dollars.

## NOTE:

See Construction Cost Calculations Below.
Environmental/Design Costs are Assumed See Appendix H for Right-of-Way Cost Calculations.
NOTES: Construction Engineering/Inspection Costs are Assumed to be a fixed 15\% of the Construction Cost
CORYDON-NEW MIDDLETOWN-ELIZABETH ROAD

| CONSTRUCTION COST | $\$ 25,500,000.00$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| ENVIRONMENTAL/SURVE Y/DESIGN COST | $\$ 2,535,800.00$ |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY COST | $\$ 3,225,000.00$ |
| CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING/INSPECTION COST | $\$ 3,825,000.00$ |
| PROJECT COST | $\mathbf{\$ 3 5 , 0 8 5 , 8 0 0 . 0 0}$ |


| CONSTRUCTION COSTS | LENGTH |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | NO. <br> (miles) | LANES OR <br> SIDES | COST <br> per MILE <br> $(\$)$ | TOTAL <br> COST |
| $(\$)$ |  |  |  |  |

Inflation of $15 \%$ necessary to correct 1997 costs per mile used in calculations to 2002 dollars.
NOTE:

## OUARRY ROAD <br> (2002 Dollars)



| CONSTRUCTION COST | $\$ 2, \mathbf{3 0 0 , 0 0 0 . 0 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| ENVIRONMENTAL/SURVEY/DESIGN COST | $\$ 245,400.00$ |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY COST | $\$ 172,500.00$ |
| CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING/INSPECTION COST | $\$ 345,000.00$ |
| PROJECT COST | $\$ 3,062,900.00$ |

## NOTES:

See Construction Cost Calculations Below.
Environmental/Design Costs are Assumed to be a fixed $9 \%$ of the Construction Cost and Survey Costs are $\$ 40,000$ per mile Construction Engineering/Inspection Costs are Assumed to be a fixed $15 \%$ of the Construction Cost See Appendix H for Right-of-Way Cost Calculations.

CONSTRUCTION COSTS
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST
NOTE:
Inflation of $15 \%$ necessary to correct 1997 costs per mile used in calculations to 2002 dollars.

| CONSTRUCTION COSTS | LENGTH |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| (miles) |  | | NO. |
| :---: |
| LANES OR |
| SIDES |$\quad$| COST |
| :---: |
| per MILE |
| $(\$)$ | | TOTAL |
| :---: |
| COST |
| $(\$)$ |

Harrison County

APPENDIX H
$\frac{\text { CRANDALL-LANESVILLE ROAD }}{\text { (2002 Dolars) }}$

| RIGHT-OF-WAY COSTS | QUANTITY | UNITS | COST per UNIT <br> (\$) | TOTAL COST <br> (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aggricultural Land | 35 | Acres | \$3,500.00 | \$122,500.00 |
| Residential Land | 0 | Acres | \$40,000.00 | \$0.00 |
| Industrial Land | 7 | Acres | \$45,000.00 | \$315,000.00 |
| Commercial Land | 0 | Acres | \$275,000.00 | \$0.00 |
| Total Relocation | 1 | Each | \$125,000.00 | \$125,000.00 |
| R/W Engineering | 20 | Parcel | \$3,000.00 | \$60,000.00 |
| R/W Services | 20 | Parcel | \$5,000.00 | \$100,000.00 |
| TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY COST |  |  |  | \$722,500.00 |

$\frac{\text { CORYDON-RAMSEY ROAD }}{\text { (2002 Dollars) }}$

| RIGHT-OF-WAY COSTS | QUANTITY | UNITS | COST per UNIT <br> (\$) | TOTAL COST <br> (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aggricultural Land | 6 | Acres | \$3,500.00 | \$21,000.00 |
| Residential Land | 8 | Acres | \$40,000.00 | \$320,000.00 |
| Industrial Land | 0 | Acres | \$45,000.00 | \$0.00 |
| Commercial Land | 6 | Acres | \$275,000.00 | \$1,650,000.00 |
| Total Relocation | 6 | Each | \$125,000.00 | \$750,000.00 |
| R/W Engineering | 70 | Parcel | \$3,000.00 | \$210,000.00 |
| R/W Services | 70 | Parcel | \$5,000.00 | \$350,000.00 |
| TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY COST |  |  |  | \$3,301,000.00 |

$\underbrace{\text { CONNECTOR FROM S.R. } 337 \text { TO CORYDON-RAMSEY ROAD (OPTION 1) }}_{(2002 \text { Dollars) }}$

| RIGHT-OF-WAY COSTS |  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { COST } \\ \text { per UNIT } \\ \mathbf{( \$ )}\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { TOTAL } \\ \text { COST }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| (\$) |  |  |  |  |$]$

CONNECTOR FROM S.R. 337 TO CORYDON-RAMSEY ROAD (OPTION 2)
(2002 Dollars)
Preferred Option if Proposed S.R. 337 Interchange is Constructed

| RIGHT-OF-WAY COSTS | QUANTITY | UNITS | COST <br> per UNIT <br> $\mathbf{( \$ )}$ | TOTAL <br> COST <br> $\mathbf{( \$ )}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Aggricultural Land | 21 | Acres | $\$ 3,500.00$ | $\$ 73,500.00$ |
| Residential Land | 5 | Acres | $\$ 40,000.00$ | $\$ 200,000.00$ |
| Industrial Land | 0 | Acres | $\$ 45,000.00$ | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Commercial Land | 0 | Acres | $\$ 275,000.00$ | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Total Relocation | 4 | Each | $\$ 125,000.00$ | $\$ 500,000.00$ |
| R/W Engineering | 15 | Parcel | $\$ 3,000.00$ | $\$ 45,000.00$ |
| R/W Services | 15 | Parcel | $\$ 5,000.00$ | $\$ 75,000.00$ |
| TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY COST |  |  |  | $\$ \mathbf{8 9 3 , 5 0 0 . 0 0}$ |



| RIGHT-OF-WAY COSTS | QUANTITY | UNITS | $\begin{array}{c}\text { COST } \\ \text { per UNIT } \\ \mathbf{( \$ )}\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { TOTAL } \\ \text { COST }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| (\$) |  |  |  |  |$]$

$\frac{\text { LAKE ROAD/BUCK CREEK VALLEY ROAD }}{\text { (2002 Dolara) }}$

| RIGHT-OF-WAY COSTS |  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { COST } \\ \text { Qer UNIT } \\ \mathbf{( \$ )}\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { TOTAL } \\ \text { COST }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| (\$) |  |  |  |  |$]$

$\frac{\text { watson rown }}{\text { momen }}$

| RIGHT-OF-WAY COSTS | QUANTITY | UNITS | $\begin{array}{c}\text { COST } \\ \text { per UNIT } \\ \mathbf{( \$ )}\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { TOTAL } \\ \text { COST }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| (\$) |  |  |  |  |$]$

$\frac{\text { SHILOH ROAD AND FOGEL ROAD }}{\text { (2002 Dolaras) }}$

| RIGHT-OF-WAY COSTS | QUANTITY | UNITS | $\begin{array}{c}\text { COST } \\ \text { per UNIT } \\ \mathbf{( \$ )}\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { TOTAL } \\ \text { COST }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| (\$) |  |  |  |  |$]$


| RIGHT-OF-WAY COSTS | QUANTITY | UNITS | COST per UNIT <br> (\$) | TOTAL COST <br> (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aggricultural Land | 16 | Acres | \$3,500.00 | \$56,000.00 |
| Residential Land | 0 | Acres | \$40,000.00 | \$0.00 |
| Industrial Land | 4 | Acres | \$45,000.00 | \$180,000.00 |
| Commercial Land | 1 | Acres | \$275,000.00 | \$275,000.00 |
| Total Relocation | 0 | Each | \$125,000.00 | \$0.00 |
| R/W Engineering | 11 | Parcel | \$3,000.00 | \$33,000.00 |
| R/W Services | 11 | Parcel | \$5,000.00 | \$55,000.00 |
| TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY COST |  |  |  | \$599,000.00 |

CORYDON-NEW MIDDLETOWN-ELIZABETH ROAD

| RIGHT-OF-WAY COSTS |  |  | COST <br> Qer UNIT <br> $\mathbf{( \$ )}$ | TOTAL <br> COST |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| (\$) |  |  |  |  |


| RIGHT-OF-WAY COSTS | QUANTITY | UNITS | COST per UNIT <br> (\$) | TOTAL COST <br> (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aggricultural Land | 15 | Acres | \$3,500.00 | \$52,500.00 |
| Residential Land | 0 | Acres | \$40,000.00 | \$0.00 |
| Industrial Land | 0 | Acres | \$45,000.00 | \$0.00 |
| Commercial Land | 0 | Acres | \$275,000.00 | \$0.00 |
| Total Relocation | 0 | Each | \$125,000.00 | \$0.00 |
| R/W Engineering | 15 | Parcel | \$3,000.00 | \$45,000.00 |
| R/W Services | 15 | Parcel | \$5,000.00 | \$75,000.00 |
| TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY COST |  |  |  | \$172,500.00 |

