



INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

100 North Senate Avenue
Room N642
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

PHONE: (317) 232-6601
EMAIL: rclark@indot.in.gov

Eric Holcomb, Governor
Joe McGuinness, Commissioner

NOTICE OF PROJECT ADVANCEMENT – U.S. 20 at S.R. 2 Proposed New Interchange between the Towns of Rolling Prairie and New Carlisle in LaPorte County (DES# 1383614)

December 2018

The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) held a public hearing in August of this year for proposed new interchange construction at U.S. 20 and S.R. 2, between the Towns of Rolling Prairie and New Carlisle in LaPorte County. This public hearing was held as part of an environmental analysis phase as required per the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Public involvement is an important element of a comprehensive decision-making process.

The purpose of the proposed new interchange project is to enhance safety by (1) decreasing the number of potential conflict points with the highest volumes of traffic (the east to west movement) and (2) maintaining/improving operational efficiency.

INDOT Preferred Alternative: the project will convert the existing signalized intersection to a new grade separated “dog-bone” interchange. The dog-bone interchange uses roundabouts north and south of the interchange. This modification from a more typical stop-controlled interchange further reduces conflict points and is anticipated to provide safer and more efficient access from the off-ramps into mainline traffic flow. This improved access addresses the existing intersection’s high westbound-to-southbound left turning movement. The increased efficiency allows for fewer approach lanes on the north-south leg than other intersection types resulting in a reduction of required pavement and bridge width. Traffic analysis indicates that a two-lane north-south roadway section at the intersection is adequate. The east-west corridor will remain at grade and traffic will flow interrupted. The north-south corridor will be elevated and a new bridge will be constructed overtop the east-west corridor. Roundabouts will be constructed north and south of the bridge. Visit the INDOT LaPorte District webpage at <https://www.in.gov/indot/2705.htm> for additional information regarding the project.

The purpose of this notice is two-fold. Firstly, this is an opportunity for INDOT to communicate with project stakeholders regarding the status of this project. As part of INDOT’s commitment to public involvement, it is important to keep the community informed of project developments. Secondly, this is an opportunity to formally announce the conclusion of the environmental analysis and public involvement phases.

Subsequent to reviewing and considering all comments and materials received as a result of the INDOT public hearing held at the New Prairie Middle School on Wednesday, August 1, 2018, **INDOT will advance this project towards construction, anticipated to take place in 2019.** Environmental analysis documentation, will remain available for public inspection during normal office hours at the Rolling Prairie Public Library, 1 East Michigan Street, Rolling Prairie, IN 46371, PHONE (219) 778-2390; INDOT LaPorte District Office, 315 East Blvd., LaPorte, IN; Phone 1-855-463-6848; INDOT Office of Public Involvement, IGCN Room N642, 100 North Senate Avenue, Indianapolis, IN 46204 Phone 1-855-463-6848 and on-line at: <https://www.in.gov/indot/2705.htm>.

Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

**FHWA-Indiana Environmental Document
CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION / ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM
GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

Road No./County:	US Route 20 at State Route 2
Designation Number:	1383614 & 1601711
Project Description/Termini:	New Interchange at US 20 and State Road 2

After completing this form, I conclude that this project qualifies for the following type of Categorical Exclusion (FHWA must review/approve if Level 4 CE):

<input type="checkbox"/>	Categorical Exclusion, Level 2 – The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 2 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM (Environmental Scoping Manager)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Categorical Exclusion, Level 3 – The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 3 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM, ES (Environmental Services Division)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Categorical Exclusion, Level 4 – The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 4 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM, ES, FHWA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Environmental Assessment (EA) – EAs require a separate FONSI. Additional research and documentation is necessary to determine the effects on the environment. Required Signatories: ES, FHWA

Note: For documents prepared by or for Environmental Services Division, it is not necessary for the ESM of the district in which the project is located to release for public involvement or sign for approval.

Approval N/A Paul E. B... 9-20-18
 ESM Signature Date ES Signature Date

James S. ... 10-5-18
 FHWA Signature Date

Release for Public Involvement

N/A REB 7-5-18
 ESM Initials Date ES Initials Date

RC 8-22-18 Patricia Clark 8-22-18
 Certification of Public Involvement Office of Public Involvement Date

Note: Do not approve until after Section 106 public involvement and all other environmental requirements have been satisfied.

INDOT ES/District Envy, Reviewer Signature: ... Date: 9/20/2018

Name and Organization of CE/EA Preparer: C.J. Cunningham, Troyer Group

This is page 1 of 26 Project name: New Interchange at US 20 and State Road 2 Date: July 5, 2018

Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

Part I - PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Every Federal action requires some level of public involvement, providing for early and continuous opportunities throughout the project development process. **The level of public involvement should be commensurate with the proposed action.**

Does the project have a historic bridge processed under the Historic Bridges PA*?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If No, then:		
Opportunity for a Public Hearing Required?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*A public hearing is required for all historic bridges processed under the Historic Bridges Programmatic Agreement between INDOT, FHWA, SHPO, and the ACHP.

Discuss what public involvement activities (legal notices, letters to affected property owners and residents (i.e. notice of entry), meetings, special purpose meetings, newspaper articles, etc.) have occurred for this project.

Remarks:

Notice of Entry for Survey or Investigation - Notice of Entry for Survey or Investigation letters were mailed on October 15, 2015 to property owners located in the vicinity of the project area describing the proposed project and notifying them that project personnel may be entering their property to gather data for environmental analysis. An example of this letter is located in Appendix G-1.

Section 106 Consulting - To meet the public involvement requirements of Section 106, a legal notice (Appendix D-44 through D-46) was published in the *South Bend Tribune* and *LaPorte Herald Argus* on February 26, 2018. The notice offered the public an opportunity to comment on the "No Historic Properties Affected" Section 106 finding. The public had a 30 day comment period to respond to the notice. The comment period expired on March 28, 2018 and no comments were received.

Public Hearing - The proposed project meets one or more of the conditions described in the current Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) Public Involvement Manual 2012, Part 1, Section IV.C.4, which would require INDOT to offer the public an opportunity to request a public hearing. In accordance with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) approved INDOT public involvement policy this project will require an opportunity for public comment based on the proposed project's alteration of existing traffic patterns. However, given the anticipated public concern with roundabouts being constructed as part of the preferred alternative, INDOT LaPorte District decided to forego the offering of a public hearing, and instead arranged a public hearing without first offering one via a legal notice.

A legal notice of public hearing was advertised in the *South Bend Tribune* on Monday, July 16, 2018 and Monday, July 13, 2018. The legal notice text can be found in Appendix G-4, while the proof of publication is located in Appendix G-6. The advertisement announced the project type and the time, date, and location of the hearing. The notice of public hearing was sent to affected property owners. A list of the owners to which the notice was sent can be found in Appendix G-8. The legal notice was distributed via email on two occasions to various local elected officials and various local city and county public works staff. Copies of the emails are located in Appendices G-10 through G-25. The public hearing was also advertised on INDOT's website, documentation of which can be found beginning in Appendix G-26.

The public hearing was held by INDOT's Office of Public Involvement in coordination with Troyer Group on Wednesday, August 1, 2018 at 6:00 pm (CST), at the New Prairie Middle School, 5325 North Cougar Road, New Carlisle, Indiana 46552. There were 94 attendees in total, plus six INDOT personnel and three design consultant representatives. The sign-in sheets can be found in Appendices G-30 through G-40. A presentation was given by INDOT and the design consultant. Handouts to the attendees included instructions for providing comments, a preliminary project illustration, and copies of the presentation slides, all of which can be found in Appendix G-41 through G-46. Attendees were invited to sign-up as speakers to submit official comments. Six speakers signed up (Appendix G-60 and G-61), but others were invited to submit comment. In total, fifteen attendees provided official comment during the hearing. Their comments were transcribed and are located in Appendix G-62 through G-70. Written comments were also accepted for a period of 16 days following the public hearing. Written comments were received from six members of the public, all of which can be found in Appendix G-71 through G-80.

The comments received centered around a few primary topics. One such topic was the public's preference for other alternatives such as reduced speeds, and for the intersection to remain signalized with corresponding sight distance improvements. The public also raised concern with the impact free-flowing traffic on the east-west corridor might have negative impacts upon nearby intersections by reducing or removing gaps necessary to cross or turn onto SR 2 and US

Project name: New Interchange at US 20 and State Road 2 Date: September 19, 2018

Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte

Route US 20 & SR 2

Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

20. The unsafe conditions present at the existing intersection were also commented on by the public. All of the comments received both during the hearing and those submitted in writing have been summarized in tables located in Appendix G-81 through G-90. The tables also include responses to each of the comments, as prepared by INDOT and the design consultant.

Public Controversy on Environmental Grounds

Will the project involve substantial controversy concerning community and/or natural resource impacts?

Yes

No

Remarks:

Some public controversy is known to exist regarding roundabouts along state routes in rural areas. The level of controversy concerning this project is not yet known. The opportunity is needed to educate the public about roundabouts and about roundabout interchanges and the safety they provide.

Project name: New Interchange at US 20 and State Road 2 Date: September 19, 2018

Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte

Route US 20 & SR 2

Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

ramps will intersect the north-south corridor at two new roundabouts. In addition to improvements immediately surrounding the interchange, the northern leg of US 20 will be reduced from a divided 4-lane section to a multi-direction 2-lane section between the interchange and 600' northeast of US 20's intersection with C.R. N 600 E, where the road currently transitions to a 2-lane section. The roadway and bridge improvements will be constructed simultaneously, but are being designed under separate INDOT designation numbers – Des. No. 1383614 for the roadway work and Des. No. 1601711 for the bridge work.

The majority of the project's excavation will involve fill work to build up the ramp approaches for the bridge overtop the east-west route. Previously stockpiled material remains in the intersection's northwest quadrant, which will be removed to a depth of approximately 15 feet and relocated elsewhere within the construction limits. Underdrain and culverts will be installed beneath the improved roadways, which will require excavation to a depth of 4 to 5 feet.

The maintenance of traffic (MOT) will be phased. The first phase will involve lane restrictions along the east-west corridor (down to a single lane in each direction) and road closures with corresponding detours for the north-south corridor. During the first phase of construction, work will focus on the construction of the north and south roundabouts, ramps in all four quadrants of the intersection, and construction of the bridge's center pier. The state route detour will utilize SR 39 to the west and US 31 to the east. Detoured traffic will be directed between those roads by way of US 20/SR 2, through the subject intersection. A map of the detour route can be found in Appendix B-20.

The second phase of the project construction will maintain the complete closure of the north-south route and require the same detour discussed above, and will still require lane restrictions on the east-west corridor to accommodate construction of the north and south bridge piers. Additional temporary daytime closures with flaggers will also be necessary during the placement of beams or other work on the structure. Such closings are not anticipated to occur for more than two days. During the second phase of construction, work will focus on the construction of the bridge and the on/off ramp tie-ins. MOT and detour sheets are available in Appendix B-18 through B-20.

Additional right-of-way is not anticipated to be necessary, as right-of-way was set aside when the intersection was first constructed in the early 1960's. The current intersection of State Road 2 and US 20 did not take its current shape until after 1960. The intersection was previously located to the west at what is now the intersection of Oak Knoll Road at US 20. Oak Knoll Road previously served as the intersection's northern US 20 leg and the southern SR 2 leg. Construction plans were prepared in 1960 to shift the intersection to the east to its current location by re-aligning the intersection's southern and northern legs. The plans called for a "future interchange" and the corresponding right-of-way was acquired at that time along with that which was necessary for realigned roadway corridors.

The preferred alternative meets the project's purpose and need by:

- 1) Introducing an intersection geometry with many fewer conflicts among turning movements, both by separating the grade among the east-west and north-south corridors and by incorporated roundabouts among the interchanges, which have fewer conflict point than traditional stop-controlled or signalized intersections.
- 2) Providing a free-flowing route along the east west corridor that will encourage heavy vehicle traffic to utilize the eastern SR 2 leg rather than the northern US 20 leg as a connection between US 31 and the western US 20 leg, thereby deterring such traffic from travelling through New Carlisle.
- 3) Improving the design year operation efficiency from LOS A to LOS C (per Highway Capacity Manual calculations, which assesses average intersection delay).

Minor design revisions have occurred since the draft environmental document was released for public involvement. The revisions resulted from comments received from the FHWA. The entry/exit configuration into and out of the nearby Junction City truck stop was changed. Originally, westbound traffic out of Junction City could turn left on US 20. Eastbound traffic out of Junction City was required to turn directly into one of the eastbound travel lanes or the eastbound off-ramp. The revised design will accommodate westbound left turns into Junction City, but will disallow westbound left turns out of Junction City. As was included in the original design, the westbound traffic entering Junction City will be accommodated by a dedicated left turn lane. Eastbound traffic entering Junction City will still be accommodated by a dedicated right-turn lane, to be constructed adjacent to the proposed eastbound off-ramp. Westbound traffic out of Junction City must turn right/eastbound on US 20, maneuver through the booth interchange roundabout, then merge onto US 20 westbound. The right turning movements out of Junction City will be accommodated by dedicated acceleration lane adjacent to the eastbound offramp. Additionally, the updated plans altered the overall roadway footprint by adding over-sized, over-weight (OSOW) truck concrete aprons surrounding each of the interchange's roundabouts, and the SR 2 pavement was widened along the eastbound outside shoulder towards the CR 600 intersection.

See Appendices B-1 through B-8 for project illustrations and project area photographs. Refer to Appendices B-9 through B-54 for original the roadway design plans appended to the draft environmental document, Appendices B-55 through B-67 for the revised plan and profile/pavement marking sheets illustrating the design revisions, and Appendices B-68 through B-84 for the bridge design plans (which have remained unchanged since their inclusion in the draft environmental document).

Project name: New Interchange at US 20 and State Road 2

Date: September 19, 2018

Response to Public Comments - Transcribed from Public Hearing – US 20 at SR 2 New Interchange (Des. 1383614/1601711)

Commenter Name:	General Nature of Comment:	Response to Comment:
Rick Mrozinski (LaPorte County Commissioner)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem is not only at this intersection, but with people speeding, texting, talking on the phone, semi-trucks running red lights • Recommend changing the speed limit to 45 MPH a half mile before the intersection. Also, use photo enforcement for red light running or speeding • Comments that discussions with citizens regarding roundabouts come with a lot of complaints • Offered cooperation from the LaPorte County Commissioners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The removal of the traffic signal will improve the safety of the intersection by allowing the semi-trucks unimpeded access through the intersection. • No matter the posted speed limit, speeding traffic and otherwise unsafe drivers will likely persist but is not anticipated to be made worse by the proposed improvements. Photo-enforcement may deter some motorists from running a red-light, but it will not eliminate the unsafe intersection configuration that permits injury-causing accidents to occur. • All intersections, including roundabouts, are designed to accommodate the vehicles that traverse them. On rural SR 2 and US 20 this includes school buses, emergency vehicles, semi-trucks, and the occasional combine or farm implement. If the roundabouts remain the preferred alternative for the interchange ramps, they will be designed to accommodate all movements for a school bus as well as other design vehicles. Please refer to the following link for a brochure explaining how to safely and correctly navigate a roundabout: http://www.in.gov/indot/files/PI_RoundaboutBrochure.pdf • Thank you for your cooperation. INDOT will continue to work with the county into the future.
Hal Benjamin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In an effort to minimize traffic through New Carlisle why not switch the route numbers to decrease motorist's confusion? • Concerned about the clearing of snow on the dogbone interchange • The existing light breaks up traffic to allow motorists to cross SR-2 to get onto Cougar Road. Free flowing traffic will eliminate sufficient traffic gaps • How will farm machinery maneuver the roundabouts? • Concerned about possible trucks and motorists performing U-Turns at Oak Knoll Road since they missed their turn within the roundabouts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The switching of the route numbers requires an agreement with local officials, county officials, the United State Post Office, local citizens and American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). • INDOT plow drivers are trained to properly clear roundabouts and bridges during snow and ice events • The intersection of SR 2 at Cougar Rd is 1.2 miles east of the subject intersection. Over that distance, gaps resulting from the traffic signal phases at the intersection of US 20 and SR2 become less pronounced at Cougar Road. INDOT recognizes the issues present at this intersection and is continually monitoring it while actively working to address additional locations in upcoming years. • All intersections, including roundabouts, are designed to accommodate the vehicles that traverse them. On rural SR 2 and US 20 this includes school buses, emergency vehicles, semi-trucks, and the occasional combine or farm implement. If the roundabouts remain the preferred alternative for the interchange ramps, they will be designed to accommodate all movements for a school bus as well as other design vehicles. Please refer to the following link for a brochure explaining how to safely and correctly navigate a roundabout: http://www.in.gov/indot/files/PI_RoundaboutBrochure.pdf • "No U-Turn" signs are not incorporated into the intersection signage plans. The Interchange and the ramps will be correctly signed for all travelling motorists as outlined in the Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

Response to Public Comments - Transcribed from Public Hearing – US 20 at SR 2 New Interchange (Des. 1383614/1601711)

Commenter Name:	General Nature of Comment:	Response to Comment:
Steve Osbourne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the Indiana Toll Road Lease Agreement from 2006, under certain conditions, US 20 could be designated as competing highway that conforms to the definition of a competing highway • An Interstate quality interchange would violate this lease agreement. • Requests that INDOT receive written correspondence from the Indiana Toll Road Concession Company (ITRCC) that this project does not violate the lease agreement. • Does not like roundabouts • Suggests the use of computerized traffic signal equipment to detect red light runners and allow the main traffic movement to stay green longer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to INDOT in-house legal counsel, the proposed interchange does not meet Interstate Highway criteria as there is a private drive entrance near the interchange. Therefore, this project is not in violation of the Indiana Toll Road Lease Agreement. It would have to be an "Interstate Highway" quality interchange, which this is not. • The project is intended to increase intersection safety and it does not violate the Indiana Toll Road Lease Agreement signed in 2006. • INDOT Legal has addressed the question, see comments above. No further correspondence with ITRCC is necessary. • The current traffic signal has computerized traffic control equipment already in use. The intersection's main safety issues are rear-end collisions and red-light running.
Laurie Nanista	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the 5-month detour, 19,000 vehicles per day (VPD) would use Oak Knoll Road as a local detour • Safety compromised during construction with the increased traffic along the local roads CR-400 North and CR-600 East • The new bridge won't allow traffic to stop thus making it harder to cross US 20 or SR 2 near the interchange • This interchange design is very similar to SR 49 at Vale Park Road in Valparaiso 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At present only 12,000 VPD traverse entire intersection. This accounts for vehicles entering from every direction. The 19,000 VPD figure was provided as the projected intersection volume in 20 years. • The primary movement with the greatest traffic will remain open, the US 20 to SR 2 east-west movements. The state primary detour routes for SR 2 out of LaPorte is SR 39 North to US 20 East to SR 2 East to US 31 Bypass. For US 20 West towards New Carlisle will be US 31 South to SR 2 West to US 20 West to SR 39 South. Locally originating traffic would be the most likely users of Oak Knoll Road or other local roads. This amount of traffic would be a small percentage of the overall traffic that currently traverses the intersection. • The design of the roundabouts on either side of the bridge will allow the traffic to slow down and US 20 north/east of the interchange is being narrowed to one lane in each direction, thus making the route safer. • This project's design is similar to that of SR 49 at Vale Park Road.

Response to Public Comments - Transcribed from Public Hearing – US 20 at SR 2 New Interchange (Des. 1383614/1601711)

Commenter Name:	General Nature of Comment:	Response to Comment:
Deb Yerklter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to make left out of driveway onto US 20, there is at least a break in traffic with the existing signal. • With the repaving why not add a left turn lane for us to use? • Recommends opening up the existing intersection like US 30 and US 421, add more lights, it will not take any more additional land to add the additional lighting. • In favor of keeping the existing signal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peak hour traffic wait times for turning movements from private drives is not anticipated to be significantly affected. INDOT will continue to monitor the safety of the subject roadways and the intersecting roads and drives. • The area for the left turn lane is outside of this project limits and would need to be addressed at a later date. • The intersection already has adequate sight distances, the intent of this project is safety oriented and intended to eliminate rear-end crashes and red-light running motorists. • Thank you for your comment, see comments above related to the removal of the signal and as to why it is justified.
Vincent Casmar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will wide loads navigate the SR 2 westbound to SR 2 southbound movement through the dog-bone interchange? • Try the traffic circles in Valparaiso and the Interchange at SR 49 and Vale Park Road, this is similar to this proposed design • Why not a larger diameter traffic circle at this intersection? • The present design makes it harder for snow and ice removal and trucks will slide off the overpass onto the roadway underneath such as the truck on I 94 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This has been reviewed in regard to the OSOW (oversize and overweight) movements through the entire interchange. The design complies with OSOW standards and will allow OSOW vehicles to move through the interchange safely. • Correct - This project's design is similar to that of SR 49 at Vale Park Road. • A large diameter traffic circle was not evaluated as a potential alternative as it would require additional ROW and affect a larger number of property owners in the vicinity of the project area. It would also fail to meet the project's purpose of deterring truck traffic from utilizing US 20 through New Carlisle as a shortcut between the western leg of the intersection and US 31 north. • INDOT plow drivers are trained to properly clear roundabouts and bridges during snow and ice events
Bill Yelder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic has increased in the area since 1972 when he moved to the area • There is Interstate Highway type traffic moving through the area, why not build an Interstate quality road through the area? • Highway 20 is a residential highway • All truck traffic is moving off of US 30 and US 6 to US 20/SR 2 in this area • INDOT does not look at the impact to businesses or residents • With 60,000 VPD in the future, the state should consider building an Interstate Highway along the South Shore Line just north of here 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • True, there has been steady increase in traffic due to the increase of the population in the area and the expansion of commercial transport through the area. • A new interstate would violate the Indiana Toll Road Lease Agreement signed in 2006. • Highway 20 is a Rural Minor Arterial and according to the FHWA, it links cities and larger towns to form an integrated network providing interstate and intercountry service. They have relatively high travel speeds and minimum interference to through movement. • The preferred alternative can handle the existing truck traffic and the anticipated traffic growth. INDOT will monitor continue monitor the safety of the subject roadways and the impact additional truck traffic may have. • INDOT evaluates impacts on local businesses within or near the project area. There is a business within the project limits that is being accommodated with dedicated left and right turn lanes into their business as well as additional overhead signage. Also, during construction, there will be updates provided by INDOT communications staff.

Response to Public Comments - Transcribed from Public Hearing – US 20 at SR 2 New Interchange (Des. 1383614/1601711)

Committer Name:	General Nature of Comment:	Response to Comment:
	(continued from prior page)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) mandated Environmental Documentation process, INDOT is required by law to look at the impacts to businesses and residents near the project area. At present only 12,000 VPD traverse entire intersection. This accounts for vehicles entering from every direction. The near-60,000 VPD figure provided during the presentation was the maximum volume that could be accommodated by the preferred alternative. The 19,000 VPD figure provided is the projected volume in 20 years. The construction of an "Interstate Highway" facility would violate the Indiana Toll Road Lease Agreement signed in 2006. This project is being constructed to improve the safety at the existing intersection.
Speaker #1 (No name given)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The state should consider installing cable wires in the median to stop vehicles from crossing into the on-coming lanes. Should add additional police patrols Fix the pavement at the intersection LaPorte County has payroll tax, does that money go into roads? The reason for the increased traffic, is the increase on tolls on the Indiana Toll Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This recommendation is outside of the scope of the project. INDOT will continue to monitor the safety of the subject roadways in order to evaluate other potential improvements. The presence of increased police patrols will be at the discretion of the Indiana State Police and LaPorte County Sherriff's Department. This project will address the existing pavement issues The local payroll/road taxes are to be used on locally maintained roads only - not on roads maintained by INDOT. The increase in traffic is due to an increase in area populations and the travelling public's commuter habits. Traffic increase resulting from toll increases are not easily quantifiable.
Connie Gramarossa (LaPorte County Commissioner)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 19,000 VPD use county roads, who is going to repair them? They are in bad shape now and is INDOT going to come back and pave them afterwards? How will the roads be handled during the detour, how will this be addressed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At present only 12,000 VPD traverse entire intersection. This accounts for vehicles entering from every direction. The 19,000 VPD figure provided is the projected volume in 20 years. INDOT and the LaPorte County will coordinate regarding the local detour and INDOT may, if needed, reimburse the County for repairs the local roads used after the project has been completed.
Dave Ulman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This project is going to be great for us What if the crossroads were all on road, such as SR-2 coming out of LaPorte and continuing to New Carlisle and then onto South Bend. The same could be said of US-20 as the continuous east-west route from Michigan City to South Bend 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for your comment The switching of the route numbers requires an agreement with local officials, county officials, the United State Post Office, local citizens and AASHTO.

Response to Public Comments - Transcribed from Public Hearing – US 20 at SR 2 New Interchange (Des. 1383614/1601711)

Commenter Name:	General Nature of Comment:	Response to Comment:
Denise Cannon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lives on Oak Knoll Road and is one of seven that will be impacted by the construction. Can signs be added for northbound traffic towards New Carlisle that read "No trucks, except local deliveries"? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The contractor is required to work only within the construction limits of the project as shown in the project plans. The construction limits do not extend to Oak Knoll Road, therefore there will be no direct impacts. Indirect impacts to Oak Knoll Road may involve increased traffic as some local motorists may use the road as a local detour. No such signs will be added as part of this project, and it's unlikely that they would be added absent the proposed improvement. US 20 will remain a federal route capable of handling truck traffic and trucks will be permitted through New Carlisle. The proposed improvements, however, will encourage trucks to use the east-west route in lieu of driving through New Carlisle.
Jessica Sheeler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with rate of speed of cars on US 20 and SR 2. With the stop light, they at least stop or attempt to stop. With the dog-bone interchange they will only go faster. Concerned about school bus safety with the traffic not slowing down. Does not want a dog-bone interchange for 33,000 cars, I think we want less than 12,000 cars. This is just too much traffic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Top-end speeds should not be affected by the proposed improvements. The current stop light allows for uninterrupted flow during green lights. The local school systems has bussing procedures in place ensure the safety school children. The current traffic counts for the entire intersection is 12,000 VPD with a projected increase to 19,000 VPD in 20 years. This is the normal growth rate of the intersection and the primary growth is along the east-west legs.
Speaker #2 (No name given)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rate of speed of traffic through the area, the speed lowers to 45 MPH before the intersection yet, no one slows down Concerned about the safety of the school children and the buses through the area. The intersection of SR 2 and Cougar Road should be the priority due to the poor visibility and the high rates of speeds in the area. This intersection is used by school buses, inexperienced teen age drivers and the elderly. A westbound right turn lane should be added on US 20. Does not like the roundabout idea, it should be a traditional diamond shape. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speeding traffic will likely persist but is not anticipated to be made worse by the proposed improvements. The presence of increased police patrols will be at the discretion of the Indiana State Police and LaPorte County Sherriff's Department. The local school system has bussing procedures in place ensure the safety school children. The intersection of SR-2 and Cougar Rd is outside the scope of this project. INDOT will monitor continue monitor the intersection of SR 2 at Cougar Road upon completion of the interchange in order to assess its safety and efficiency. A westbound right turn lane was studied during the preliminary engineering phase and ruled out due to local property impacts. The diamond shape interchange was analyzed during the planning phase and it was ruled out due to 10-month detour, higher potential for accidents, higher life cycle cost associated to the bridge (it is a longer bridge than the other configurations), and the overall higher project costs.

Response to Public Comments - Transcribed from Public Hearing – US 20 at SR 2 New Interchange (Des. 1383614/1601711)

Commenter Name:	General Nature of Comment:	Response to Comment:
Bill Yelder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic signal timing at SR 2 and US 20, the yellow light phase is at the federal minimum of 4 seconds. Yet, it takes semis at 80,000 pounds, 7-8 seconds to stop. Can the timing be adjusted? • Can the state put in concrete to the approaches to the traffic signal so the pavement does not become lumpy due to the heavy trucks stopping on the hot asphalt? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current signal phasing has been optimized based on several factors. Altering the traffic phases could potentially allow more semis to stop during a yellow-light phase but could have adverse effects on overall intersection efficiency. If a traffic signal were to remain at the intersection, injury-causing accidents would continue to occur at a high rate. • The pavement treatments will be evaluated by the INDOT Pavement Section to determine the best solution for pavement to be replaced by the proposed improvement.
Speaker #3 (No name given)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about roundabouts at the bridge ends. How will this be handled during the snow and ice season? • The speed limit is 45 MPH but, people do not slow down 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INDOT plow drivers are trained to properly clear roundabouts and bridges during snow and ice events • Speeding traffic will likely persist but is not anticipated to be made worse by the proposed improvements. The presence of increased police patrols will be at the discretion of the Indiana State Police and LaPorte County Sherriff's Department.

Response to Written Public Comments – US 20 at SR 2 New Interchange (Des. 1383614/1601711)

Commenter Name:	General Nature of Comment:	Response to Comment:
Deborah Yerofer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Driveway access will become more difficult after the interchange is constructed • This will leave a 15-mile open stretch with no traffic signals from Quince Rd in St Joseph county to Fail Rd in LaPorte county • There are no left turn areas or wide shoulders for school buses, garbage trucks and postal deliveries • An early plan a cloverleaf was planned at this same intersection, what happened with that proposal? • Post more speed signs, add No Jake Brake signs, increase police patrols 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peak hour traffic may increase wait times for turning movements from private drives, especially when turning left. INDOT will continue to monitor the safety of the subject roadways and the intersecting roads and drives. • This will allow the traffic to spread out and offer safer access opportunities • The travelling public must adhere to school bus stopping laws and all four lanes of traffic must stop for buses. Also, drivers should use caution for garbage trucks and postal deliveries as they do on any other public roadway. • A cloverleaf option would require significant amounts of additional right-of-way. Because other alternatives involving little-to-no additional right-of-way are determined feasible, the cloverleaf alternative was not evaluated in detail. • Speeding traffic will likely persist but is not anticipated to be made worse by the proposed improvements. The presence of increased police patrols will be at the discretion of the Indiana State Police and LaPorte County Sherriff's Department.
Judith Cloonan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Near Cougar Rd and SR-2, the speed limit is 45 MPH but, no one ever slows down for it. If the signal is removed at US-20 and SR-2 then it will only get worse • Within roundabouts, people do not slow down, when snow and ice comes there are slide offs, large farm equipment and trucks have a hard time maneuvering the roundabout • Bridge, would cause non-stop traffic on US-20 to SR-2 eastbound, this will make it impossible for drivers to get out of side roads. • The traffic would travel at faster speeds than what is posted on the signs • It increases the dangers at SR 2 and US 20 at the Cougar Road intersections, North and South of the schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intersection of SR 2 at Cougar Rd is 1.2 miles east of the subject intersection. Over that distance, gaps resulting from the traffic signal phases at the intersection of US 20 and SR2 become less pronounced at Cougar Road. INDOT recognizes the issues present at this intersection and is continually monitoring it while actively working to address additional locations in upcoming years. • All intersections, including roundabouts, are designed to accommodate the vehicles that traverse them. On rural SR 2 and US 20 this means school buses, emergency vehicles, semi-trucks, and the occasional combine. If the roundabouts remain the preferred improvement for the interchange ramps, it will be designed to accommodate all movements for a school bus as well as other design vehicles. Please refer to the following link for a brochure explaining how to safely and correctly navigate a roundabout: http://www.in.gov/indot/files/PI_RoundaboutBrochure.pdf • INDOT plow drivers are trained to properly clear roundabouts and bridges during snow and ice events • Speeding traffic will likely persist but is not anticipated to be made worse by the proposed improvements. The presence of increased police patrols will be at the discretion of the Indiana State Police and LaPorte County Sherriff's Department. • See first response above regarding intersection at Cougar Road. • SR-2 at Cougar Rd and US-20 at Cougar Rd were not included in this project's scope.

Response to Written Public Comments – US 20 at SR 2 New Interchange (Des. 1383614/1601711)

Committer Name:	General Nature of Comment:	Response to Comment:
(continued from prior page)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestions to help eliminate truck and non-local traffic. Keep the existing signal at US 20 and SR 2 and add the following signals: SR 2 at Cougar Rd, US 20 at Cougar Rd, SR 2 at Larson Rd, US 20 at Smilax Rd and change the flashing light in Rolling Prairie on US 20 to regular traffic signal • At the US-20/SR-2 traffic signal, add a delay to green light to allow extra time for the truck traffic to pass. Also, a "Signal will turn Red, when this starts flashing, prepare to STOP" sign with a flashing light. • Use cement as opposed to asphalt at the intersection • Change the speed limit to 45 MPH from Fail Rd to County Line Rd (Laporte/St Joseph). Also, in Rolling Prairie, make the entire distance 45 MPH with police presence, especially for school time and rush hour – morning, afternoon and evening. From County Line Rd to South Bend, make the speed limit 50 MPH. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The traffic signal is no longer safe due to the high injury crash rate. Red-light running and rear ends in the dilemma zone. The intersection has good visibility yet a high crash rate due to high speeds and heavy vehicles bit being able or wanting to stop. The other signals that are suggested are outside of the scope and intent of this project and would have to be evaluated at a later date. • The pavement treatments will be evaluated by the INDOT Pavement Section to determine the best solution for pavement to be replaced by the proposed improvement. • Traffic speeds and accident data are routinely reviewed after a new project has been completed. This project will be thoroughly evaluated by way of a post-construction review process.
Carl Goscinlak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes interchange. • Main concern is increased speeds to east-west traffic flow. • US-20 at Cougar Rd is very dangerous, even with the flashing light. With the removal of the light at (US-2 and Sr-2), the chances of accidents will increase. • Add more stoplights on US-20 • Thank you letting us residents voice our opinions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All alternatives were evaluated during the Project Engineering Assessment Phase and the safest, most cost-effective alternative was selected. Since, the intent of this project was to eliminate the high rear end crash rates and the red-light running, the selected alternative would fulfill the intent of this project. • Traffic speeds and accident data are routinely reviewed after a new project has been completed, this project will follow the same evaluation process as other INDOT projects. • The intersection of SR 2 at Cougar Rd is 1.2 miles east of the subject intersection. Over that distance, gaps resulting from the traffic signal phases at the intersection of US 20 and SR2 become less pronounced at Cougar Road. INDOT recognizes the issues present at this intersection and is continually monitoring it while actively working to address were locations in upcoming years. • You are welcome, thank you for attending the hearing and voicing your concerns.

Response to Written Public Comments – US 20 at SR 2 New Interchange (Des. 1383614/1601711)

Commenter Name:	General Nature of Comment:	Response to Comment:
Angel Stock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The stoplight at US 20 and SR 2 provides a break in traffic flow. Without the stoplight, traffic flow will be constant. • The already dangerous intersection at the top of the hill at CR 700 E (Cougar Rd) and S-2 will no longer have this for traffic to cross. • If a stoplight or a "Slow Down School Zone" sign is installed at the above crossing than many accidents or near misses could be avoided. • A better solution, open up the intersection with better lighting and removing the hills to make it easier to see from a distance. • This area is too close to the schools with new drivers and a small town with school bus traffic to not consider choices to slow down traffic, not to speed it up. • How will traffic going west be able to access the restaurants to the west of the US 20 and SR 2 intersection safely? • Has a traffic study been conducted for this project? • Also, there are 6 cross roads within 3 miles of Rolling Prairie with little or no visibility which already makes it hard to cross US-20. • Please reconsider the removal of the signal at this intersection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intent of this project was to eliminate the high rear end crash rates and the red-light running, the selected alternative would fulfill the intent of this project. • The intersection of SR 2 at Cougar Rd is 1.2 miles east of the subject intersection. Over that distance, gaps resulting from the traffic signal phases at the intersection of US 20 and SR2 become less pronounced at Cougar Road. INDOT recognizes the issues present at this intersection and is continually monitoring it while actively working to address additional locations in upcoming years. • The intersection already has adequate sight distances, the intent of this project is safety oriented and intended to eliminate rear-end crashes and red-light running motorists. • Access to the truck stop just west of the US 20 at SR 2 intersection being accommodated by the new interchange design. All safety considerations have been taken into consideration for the access to the truck stops. The westbound left turn lane is long enough to allow the semi driver enough room to decelerate and safely make the turn into the truck stop without impeding the westbound travelling speed. • As part of the Preliminary Engineering Assessment phase, a traffic study is required according to the Indiana Design Manual – Chapter 48. • Upon completion of construction, INDOT will continue to monitor the safety of the subject roadways and the intersecting roads and drives. • A traffic signal has been ruled out since the intent of this project was to eliminate the high rear end crash rates and the red-light running, the selected alternative would fulfill the intent of this project.
(Indiscernible Signature)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will this project effect the surrounding property values? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is not anticipated to have appreciable effect on neighboring property values.

Response to Written Public Comments – US 20 at SR 2 New Interchange (Des. 1383614/1601711)

Committer Name:	General Nature of Comment:	Response to Comment:
Chris and Linda Williamson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Happy to see something done with intersection, they know that semi-trucks travel this way to avoid the Toll Road. • Hoped for a longer delay between the red and green signal phases, the semi-trucks regularly ignore the red signal and blow through the light, local residents are aware of this and wait before proceeding on the green signal. • If the proposed dog-bone interchange is constructed, please analyze putting a few stop lights to help local residents or you will just be relocating and the accidents and fatalities to these secondary crossings. • The first and most important, SR 2 at Cougar Rd (700 E). Currently has a yellow flashing light and a 45 MPH speed limit. Many local residents avoid going to sporting events due to the difficulty of leaving the schools and entering/traversing SR 2 in the area. • Based on lessons learned, this intersection should not repeat the Fail Rd and US 20 intersection. It took years and numerous accidents and fatalities to finally get rumble strips and a stop light. • Other intersections to consider for a traffic signal are SR 2 and 600 E, SR 2 and Timothy Rd, US 20 and Byron Rd and naturally SR 2 and Cougar Rd and US 20 and Cougar Rd. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for comments • The current signal phasing has been optimized based on several factors. Altering the traffic phases could potentially allow more semis to stop during a yellow-light phase but could have adverse effects on overall intersection efficiency. If a traffic signal were to remain at the intersection injury-causing accidents would continue to occur at a high rate. • The intersection of SR 2 at Cougar Rd is 1.2 miles east of the subject intersection. Over that distance, gaps resulting from the traffic signal phases at the intersection of US 20 and SR2 become less pronounced at Cougar Road. INDOT recognizes the issues present at this intersection and is continually monitoring it while actively working to address additional locations in upcoming years. • Traffic speeds and accident data are routinely reviewed after a new project has been completed, this project will be thoroughly evaluated by way of a post-construction review process.