

MEMORANDUM

TO: File
FROM: Brian O'Neill, Strategic Development Group, Inc.
DATE: January 10, 2007
RE: INDOT US 231 / SR 46 / SR 67 Corridor Planning Study and Environmental Assessment

US 231 / SR 46 Corridor Study
Spencer, Indiana
Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting
January 10, 2007
2:30 P.M.

This date a meeting was held at the Owen County State Bank, 201 W. Morgan Street, Spencer, Indiana from 2:30 – 4:30 with the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) to discuss the Purpose and Need Report prepared for the project. This was the first of a series of meetings that are required by Indiana's Streamlined EIS Procedures.

A list of those attending is attached.

The meeting began with a PowerPoint presentation by **ms consultants, inc.** (see attached) discussing the findings of the Purpose and Need study. A Question and Answer period followed the presentation. Following is a summary of the proceedings.



CAC members listen to the Purpose and Need study findings.

- The accuracy of the data was questioned because observations were only made during the summer. It was suggested that the schools being in session would change the equation. The consultants answered that INDOT provided daily traffic volumes along Morgan Street, which were taken during the school year. The INDOT deliverable schedule mandated on-site analysis be performed during the summer months. Because peak volume levels for school traffic occur at different times than normal AM and PM peaks, the volume levels used for analysis would accommodate school traffic. Projected future (2030) volume level forecasts were prepared by another consultant and provided to ms consultants by INDOT.
- No weekend analyses were made in the course of the study.
- It was asked if the study addressed drainage issues. The consultants reported that impacts due to drainage and weather conditions of roadways would be addressed in a later part of the study.
- The Planning Study and Environmental Assessment revealed that Morgan Street (US 231/ SR 46) is 4 feet too narrow to provide the minimum standard roadway width through town.

- CAC members wanted to know if the study observed vehicles accessing the corridor from side roads. The consultants responded that they did not measure waiting times, but did observe vehicles attempting to access Morgan Street. Those observations indicted some delays in getting out of side roads and local drives.
- Automatic traffic monitors (tube counters) along Hillside and Franklin streets revealed between 1,000-2,000 vehicles per day, which is considered typical of that classification of roadway. The consultants performed two full days of on-site traffic counting. The scope of work did not include more physical observations than at the signals.
- Residents were curious to know what plans INDOT already has for junction of SR 46 on the west side of Spencer, where the schools are located. This area is perceived as a problem area. A representative from INDOT responded that a road widening and intersection improvement project was under design and construction should begin in 2011.
- The movement (relocation) of the railroad should remain an option. It will be investigated during the screening process for potential solutions.
- The “success criteria” of a project is not entirely dependent on Levels of Service indicators. Success is determined by a matrix of factors: community acceptance, reasonable cost, reasonable crash parameters, and Level of Service. A successful plan should score “acceptable” or higher in every category. The final solution has to accommodate a range of people.

The meeting then broke into four small groups with the task of identifying additional issues that affected the operation of the US 231 / SR 46 / SR 67 corridor. A copy of the draft report was available as well as aerial photographs of the project corridor. Each group then reported a summary of their discussion. Following is a summary of those comments.

- Surrounding roads, especially Hillside Drive near the elementary school, are an issue that should be addressed. These routes are dangerous.
- The railroad should be eliminated or relocated. Emergency services would like to see the railroad relocated to south side of town, north of the White River if possible.
- The river is a problem issue due to flooding. Flooding has become worse in recent years, especially along the main streets (Clay Street through Jefferson and Wayne). Locating the railroad south of the town but north of the river would potentially provide a levee to protect the town from flooding



CAC members work in groups to identify additional issues affected by the US 231/ SR 46 / SR 67 corridor.

- Spencer's population is actually decreasing, because the town has not changed the shape or the size of town in several years. The town is considering annexations, primarily to the west of town, in the near future.
- Turn areas (radii) need to be addressed and improved for semi-trucks coming east trying to turn north on to US 231. The same problems occur when southbound trucks turn east on onto SR 46 from US 231.
- Growth of the town is constrained in terms of topography to the north, east and south. Interstate access is an issue on the west side of town.
- Changes to this corridor can either save the town or be its demise.

Attendance Report

CAC Members

Travis Curry, Spencer Evening World

Gwen Deiter, Owen County Sewer and Water Conservation District

Greg Denny, Chief Deputy of Spencer Police

Shelly Edwards, Town of Spencer

Bobby Hall, Owen County Economic Development

Steve Redenbaugh, Owen County Commissioner

Chester Richardson III, Owen County Sheriff

Mark Rogers, Owen County Community Foundation

Denise Shaw, Owen County Chamber of Commerce/Economic Development Corporation

Jack Simmerman, Spencer Town Council

Tony Stevens, Town of Spencer

Jack White, Owen County EMA

INDOT Representatives

Kathy Eaton

Marvin Jenkins

Jim Ude

FHWA Representative

Larry Heil

Consultants

Jim Bixby, ms consultants, inc.

Ryan Bush, ms consultants, inc.

Mike Kratofil, ms consultants, inc.

Ron Miller, ms consultants, inc.

Brian O'Neill, Strategic Development Group, Inc.

Mary Catherine Kosinski, Strategic Development Group, Inc.