



Volume III – Comments and Responses

Table of Contents

Introduction ii

Part A – Comments and Responses iv

 Federal Agency Comments (AF) AF-1

 State Agency Comments (AS)..... AS-1

 Local Government (LG) LG-1

 Public Comments - Individuals (PI) PI-1

 Public Comments - Organizations (PO)PO-1

Part B – Written Comments and Public Hearing Transcription **Separate PDF File**



INTRODUCTION

The Notice of Availability for the I-69 Section 5 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was published in the federal register on October 26, 2012. The comment period from October 26, 2012 to January 2, 2013 followed the publication of the DEIS allowing the public, local officials, and government agencies to submit comments, concerns, and questions for review. Comments on the DEIS were received from:

- Federal agencies:
 - US Department of the Interior, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
 - US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Region 5, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance

- State agencies:
 - Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM), Office of Land Quality, Geological Services and Science Services Branch
 - Indiana Department of Environmental Management, Office of Water Quality
 - Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR), Division of Historic Preservation & Archaeology (DHPA)
 - IDNR, Division of Fish and Wildlife
 - IDNR, Division of Forestry, Yellowwood and Morgan-Monroe State Forest

A total of 18 comments were received from representatives of local government units; 127 comments were received from public individuals; and 19 comments were received from public organizations. Some of the comment letters included multiple points or questions. For purposes of providing responses, these submittals were divided into 612 comments, with specific responses provided for each. In some cases, responses are provided by cross-reference to other comment responses which were identical or similar.

Part A – Comments and Responses

Part A, Comments and Responses (C/R), addresses all substantive comments made on the DEIS. The comments/responses are provided in the form of a verbatim transcription of each comment followed by a response to that comment. Comments which are not substantive¹ are acknowledged.

Each commenter's written or oral² submittal is assigned an identification code, and each comment contained in the submittal is further identified by that code plus a numerical ID. For

¹ Comments generally not considered substantive include those that only noted preference for or opposition to the project, without elaboration; and comments that did not relate specifically to the Tier 2 Section 5 study.

² Comments made and transcribed at the Public Hearing on the DEIS, held December 6, 2012, in Bloomington, Indiana.



example, AF001 is the code identifying the USEPA (AF refers to Agency – Federal). AF001-01 refers to the first comment appearing in the agency’s comment letter. Each comment is presented verbatim and is followed by Indiana Department of Transportation’s (INDOT’s) response. When all of a commenter’s comments have been addressed, the next commenter’s submittal is presented (in this case AF002, also the USEPA). State agency comments are identified as “AS,” local government comments are identified as “LG,” public individual comments are identified by “PI,” and public organization comments are identified as “PO.”

Table 1 lists all who submitted comments on the DEIS, and provides the comment/response identification code for ease of locating the comment/response in the document.

On March 4, 2013, a draft of the responses to all comments (including agencies, public organizations, and individuals) was submitted for review and consideration to the following agencies:

- Federal: USEPA; U.S. Department of Interior (USDOI), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- State: Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) and Indiana Division of Environmental Management (IDEM)

Follow up comments on the draft C/R document were received from USEPA and IDEM, who commented on some of the draft USEPA and IDEM responses. These follow up comments were considered in finalizing the C/R document. Responses which were modified to consider the follow up comments on the draft C/R document are so designated in the AF and AS comments. These agency comments from USEPA and IDEM (both dated March 19, 2013) are included in **Appendix C, Agency Coordination Correspondence**.

Part B, Written Comments and Responses

Part B, Written Comments and Public Hearing Transcription, includes a copy of each written submittal/transcribed statement submitted on the DEIS.



Volume III – Comments and Responses

PART A

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

ON

I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

SECTION 5

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Table 1: Commenters on Section 5 DEIS				
Comment ID Code	Name, Last	Name, First	Agency/ Organization	Date Submitted/ Received
FEDERAL AGENCIES				
AF001	Laszewski	Virginia	USEPA, Region 5	12/4/2012
AF002	Westlake	Kenneth	USEPA, Region 5	1/2/2013
AF003	Nelson	Lindy	USDOJ, Regional Environmental Officer	1/2/2013
STATE AGENCIES				
AS001	Sullivan	James	IDEM Office of Land Quality	11/27/2012
AS002	Allen	Jim	IDNR, Division of Forestry, Property Manager, Yellowwood and Morgan-Monroe State Forest	12/21/2012
AS003	Buffington	Matthew	IDNR Environmental Supervisor, Division of Fish and Wildlife	1/2/2013
AS004	McAhron	Ron	IDNR Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology	1/2/2013
AS005	Randolph	Jason	IDEM Office of Water Quality	12/28/2012
AS006	Hollingsworth	Mary	IDEM Office of Water Quality	1/11/2013
LOCAL GOVERNMENTS				
LG001	Livingston	Faron	Chief, Bloomington Township Department of Fire & Emergency Services	12/10/2012
LG002	Munson	Cheryl	Incoming Monroe County Council / Monroe County Historic Preservation Board	12/6/2012
LG003	Ruff	Andy	Bloomington City Council	12/6/2012
LG004	Enright	Kevin	Monroe County Surveyor	12/6/2012
LG005	Stoops	Senator Mark	State Senator District 40, Bloomington, Monroe County	12/6/2012
LG006	Livingston	Faron	Chief, Bloomington Township Department of Fire & Emergency Services	12/19/2012



Table 1: Commenters on Section 5 DEIS				
Comment ID Code	Name, Last	Name, First	Agency/ Organization	Date Submitted/ Received
LG007	Reid/ Micuda	Adrian/ Tom	City Engineer, Planning Director City of Bloomington	1/2/2013
LG008	Rosenbarger	Beth	Active Transportation Committee, Monroe County	1/2/2013
LG009	Swafford	Dan	Ellettsville Town Council	1/2/2013
LG010	Kiesling	Iris	Vice President, Monroe County Board of Commissioners	1/2/2013
LG011	Blankenship	Devin	Chair, Monroe County Historic Preservation Board	1/2/2013
LG012	Sievers	Linda G.	Trustee Bloomington Township	12/7/2012
LG013	Wilson	Larry	Monroe County Planning Department	1/2/2013
LG014	Kern	Lonnie	Washington Township Fire Department	12/19/2012
LG015	Munson	Cheryl	Incoming Monroe County Council / Monroe County Historic Preservation Board	1/2/2013
LG016	Enright	Kevin	Monroe County Surveyor	1/4/2013
LG017	Deckard	Phil	Mayor, City of Martinsville	12/12/2012
LG018	Voyles	Norman	Morgan County Commissioner	12/31/2012
PUBLIC – INDIVIDUALS				
PI001	Mann	Roberta		10/29/2012
PI002	Jackson	Ann	Sadler Real Estate	10/29/2012
PI003	May	Heidi Sheldon		11/7/2012
PI004	Cuttill	William		11/8/2012
PI005	Neal	Jason R.		11/14/2012
PI006	Wason	Adam		11/14/2012



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Table 1: Commenters on Section 5 DEIS				
Comment ID Code	Name, Last	Name, First	Agency/ Organization	Date Submitted/ Received
PI007	Sturgis	Bob	Sturgis Garage	10/31/2012
PI008	Dawson	Steve	President, HFI Mechanical Contractors	11/14/2012
PI009	Herrington	Waneeta		12/18/2012
PI010	Newsome-Head	Jessica		11/18/2012
PI011	Hall	Jay		11/19/2012
PI012	Alexander	Daniel A.		11/20/2012
PI013	Hewitt	Dawn		11/21/2012
PI014	Neal	Jason		11/23/2012
PI015	DeMoss	Brent		11/25/2012
PI016	McNamara	Eric		11/25/2012
PI017	Armstrong	Chad		11/27/2012
PI018	Drake	Larry	C&H Stone	11/27/2012
PI019	Lamm	Jan		12/3/2012
PI020	Chance	Gregory		11/5/2012
PI021	Rice	Rachel		11/28/2012
PI022	Rice	Jerry		12/2/2012
PI023	Sinders	Jim & Elizabeth		11/28/2012
PI024	Aynes	A. Wayne & Melba		11/28/2012
PI025	Catozzi	Anthony R.		11/28/2012
PI026	Devitt	Dave		11/29/2012
PI027	Rice	Nancy		11/16/2012



Table 1: Commenters on Section 5 DEIS

Comment ID Code	Name, Last	Name, First	Agency/ Organization	Date Submitted/ Received
PI028	Neal	Jason		11/14/2012
PI029	Chance	Gregory		12/3/2012
PI030	Moody	Gary		12/6/2012
PI031	Deaton	Lance		12/7/2012
PI032	Heichelbech	Adam		12/8/2012
PI033	Wyatt	Marty		12/9/2012
PI034	Lamm	Jan		12/6/2012
PI035	Barker	Joe		12/6/2012
PI036	Shelton	Jim		12/6/2012
PI037	Peoples	Sheryl		12/6/2012
PI038	Graham	Will		12/6/2012
PI039	Kinder	Tim		12/6/2012
PI040	Wyass	Matt	Broker Association F.C. Tucker/Bloomington, Realtors	12/6/2012
PI041	Kiser	Mike	Owner, Chapman Lake Instrument	12/6/2012
PI042	Holt	Benny Jane		12/6/2012
PI043	Bruning	Vincent	Lamar Advertising Indianapolis	12/6/2012
PI044	Reinhold	Meri		12/6/2012
PI045	Sturgeon	Sara		12/6/2012
PI046	Miers	Jennifer		12/6/2012



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Table 1: Commenters on Section 5 DEIS				
Comment ID Code	Name, Last	Name, First	Agency/ Organization	Date Submitted/ Received
PI047	Schiff	Melissa	Melissa A Schiff CPA PC Hillview Motel Inc Hunter Towing Inc Hunter Storage Schiff Properties LLC Serious Sports Inc Dreams in Motion Academy of Dance by Miranda Brian's Off Road Inc Plus multiple residences	12/6/2012
PI048	Griffith	David		12/6/2012
PI049	Schnatzmeyer	Todd J.		12/6/2012
PI050	Saidah	Raymond		12/6/2012
PI051	Davis	Gary and Helen		12/6/2012
PI052	McKnight	Kevin and Jeanette		12/6/2012
PI053	Timmer	Vern		12/6/2012
PI054	Venstra	Elizabeth		12/6/2012
PI055	Reeves	Dennis		12/6/2012
PI056	Pankiewicz	Lisa		12/6/2012
PI057	Terry/ Max	Karen/ Dick		12/6/2012
PI058	Puett	Pam		12/6/2012
PI059	No Name Provided			12/6/2012
PI060	Langley	Charles		12/6/2012
PI061	Jent	David		12/6/2012
PI062	Young	Frank		12/6/2012
PI063 – NOT USED				



Table 1: Commenters on Section 5 DEIS

Comment ID Code	Name, Last	Name, First	Agency/ Organization	Date Submitted/ Received
PI064	Murphy	Jim		12/6/2012
PI065	Griffith	David		12/6/2012
PI066	Brown	Ron		12/6/2012
PI067	Shelton	Jim		12/6/2012
PI068	Venstra	Elizabeth		12/6/2012
PI069	Wells	Scott		12/6/2012
PI070	Storm	Bruce		12/6/2012
PI071	Schiff	Melissa	Melissa A Schiff CPA Hillview Motel Hunter Towing Hunter Storage Schiff Properties Serious Sports Dreams in Motion Dance Academy Brian's Off-Road	12/6/2012
PI072	Pope	Jodi		12/6/2012
PI073	Bundy	Bruce		12/6/2012
PI074	Stewart	David		12/6/2012
PI075	Brewer	Nan		12/6/2012
PI076	Miers	Jen		12/6/2012
PI077	Mickel	Jennifer		12/6/2012
PI078	Walsh	Fred		12/6/2012
PI079	Heimer	Roger		12/6/2012
PI080	Lentz	Donna		12/6/2012
PI081	Rogers	Sarah		12/6/2012



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Comment ID Code	Name, Last	Name, First	Agency/ Organization	Date Submitted/ Received
PI082	Elliott	Tom		12/6/2012
PI083	Brewer	Steve		12/6/2012
PI084	Reed	Deborah Hedrick		11/28/2012
PI085	Cooksey	Robert L.		1/2/2013
PI086	Sturgis	Robert C.	Owner, Sturgis Garage	12/20/2012
PI087	Middendorf	Joan		12/20/2012
PI088	Green	Jason		12/20/2012
PI089	Cooksey	John C.		1/2/2013
PI090	Mabrey	Matt	Facilities Construction Project Manager, Management Services Division, Hoosier Energy REC, Inc.	12/26/2012
PI091	Cooksey	Charles Wm.		1/2/2012
PI092	Braganza	Peirie		1/2/2013
PI093	Leininger	Barbara		12/12/2012
PI094	Chapman	Kyle & Pamela		1/1/2013
PI095	Grimes	Rich		12/20/2012
PI096	Grimes	Rich		12/20/2012
PI097	Cuttill	William J.		12/17/2012
PI098	Goodwin	Linda		12/27/2012
PI099	Mehalechko	John	Hanna Properties	12/19/2012
PI100	Kinder	Lisa J.		12/9/2012
PI101	Reeves	Marion	President, RevSport!, Inc.	12/19/2012

**Table 1: Commenters on Section 5 DEIS**

Comment ID Code	Name, Last	Name, First	Agency/ Organization	Date Submitted/ Received
PI102	Thompson	Elizabeth	Thompson Furniture	12/31/2012
PI103	Ems-McClung	Stephanie		12/31/2012
PI104	Salmon	Dan and Marybeth		12/30/2012
PI105	Cloyd	Felice		12/29/2012
PI106	Ahler	Thomas		12/26/2012
PI107	Cooksey	Sharon R.		1/2/2013
PI108	Culp	R. Elaine		1/2/2013
PI109	Hanna	Jeff		1/2/2013
PI110	Martin	Richard A.		1/2/2013
PI111	McDaniel	Jerry E.		1/2/2013
PI112	Perez	Dennis		12/28/2012
PI113	Bigler	Michael B.		1/2/2013
PI114	McConnaughy	Larry & Hilde		1/2/2013
PI115	Vannieuwenhze	Carrie	Metaugus NPRI	1/2/2013
PI116	McCammon	Mobie L.		1/2/2013
PI117	Connaughton	Jay	Metaugus NPRI	1/2/2013
PI118	No Name Provided		Northside Christian Church	1/2/2013
PI119	Lehman	David & Cheryl		1/2/2013
PI120	Storm	Bruce	Bruce Storm Real Estate & Management Company	12/12/2012
PI121	Elsner	Ann		1/2/2013
PI122	Kiser	Mike	Owner, Chapman Lake Instrument	1/2/2013



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Table 1: Commenters on Section 5 DEIS				
Comment ID Code	Name, Last	Name, First	Agency/ Organization	Date Submitted/ Received
PI123	Bales	Richard A.		1/3/2013
PI124	Dyer	Michael B.	ECS Inc.	12/31/2012
PI125	Eads	Larry R.		1/3/2013
PI126	Ferree	Donna Lentz		1/1/2013
PI127	Mann	Roberta		12/31/2012
PI128	Smith	Craig	The Idle Zone, Inc.	11/28/2012
PUBLIC – ORGANIZATIONS				
PO001	Mittenthal	Suzanne	Knobstone Hiking Trail Association	12/6/2012
PO002	Devitt	David	Board Member, Crescent Bend Neighborhood Association	12/17/2012
PO003	Gillenwater	Christy	Hoosier Voices for I-69 / Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce	12/6/2012
PO004	Carter	Glenn	Citizens Advisory Committee to the MPO	12/6/2012
PO005	Irwin	Liz	Chamber of Commerce	12/6/2012
PO006	Maloney	Tim	Hoosier Environmental Council	12/6/2012
PO007	Jacobs	Larry	Chamber of Commerce	12/6/2012
PO008	Harrison	Mick	Citizens for Appropriate Rural Roads	12/6/2012
PO009	Hardin	Dewey J.	Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 604 - Lauren B. Strain Post	12/20/2012
PO010	Gentile	Mike	Board of Directors - Chair, The Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce	12/13/2012
PO011	Booze	Bryan	President, Windsor Private Homeowners Association	12/11/2012
PO012	Bruner	Jake	Director of Development and Administration, Hoosier Hills Food Bank	12/19/2012



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Comment ID Code	Name, Last	Name, First	Agency/ Organization	Date Submitted/ Received
PO013	Taylor	Dan	Assistant Director, Hoosier Hills Food Bank	12/19/2012
PO014	Vogelsang	Keith	Bloomington Bicycle Club	1/2/2013
PO015	Arlinghaus	Paul	Hoosier Mountain Bike Association	1/2/2013
PO016	Venstra	Elizabeth	Bloomington Transportation Options for People (B-TOP)	1/2/2013
PO017	Brown	Ronald	Bloomington Bicycle Club	12/22/2012
PO018	Maloney	Tim	Senior Policy Director, Hoosier Environmental Council	1/2/2013
PO019	Tokarski	Thomas	CARR	12/6/2012



Federal Agency Comments

AF001 **12/4/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
V. Laszewski, U.S. EPA, Region 5

AF001-01 **Comment:**

The Section 5 DEIS (p.7-13) gives the following web address for access to detailed information regarding the I-69 Community Planning Program:
<http://www.i69indyevn.org/CommunityPlanningProgram>.

However, this web address does not work. How exactly, does one access the I-69 Community Planning Program web information? thank you.

Response:

After this was brought to INDOT's attention, the link was restored, providing access to the information on the Community Planning Program. USEPA was informed of the resolution of this issue by e-mail.

AF002 **1/2/2013 E-mail (FHWA/INDOT)/Letter**
Kenneth Westlake, U.S. EPA, Region 5¹

AF002-01 **Comment:**

Submitted by e-mail from Virginia Laszewski

The attached file contains EPA's comment letter (dated 01/02/2013) regarding the I-69 Section 5 DEIS. The original signed letteres are in the mail.

[1/2/2013 Letter]

RE: I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis, Tier 2 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Section 5: Bloomington to Martinsville, Indiana.
CEQ No. 20120340

Dear Mr. Marquis and Mr. Cline:

¹ As part of ongoing coordination, draft responses to its comments were furnished to resource federal and state agencies who commented on the DEIS and a webcast was held on March 12, 2013 with resource agencies to review draft responses to comments. On March 19, 2013, USEPA provided additional clarification regarding some of its comments in a letter from Kenneth Westlake; and, IDEM provided clarification in an e-mail from James Sullivan. This correspondence can be found in Appendix C, *Agency Coordination Correspondence*. Where appropriate, references are made in responses to specific comments to indicate that the response reflects this follow up correspondence with USEPA and IDEM.

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 5 (EPA) reviewed the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)/Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) I-69 Tier 2 Section 5 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Our review and comments are provided pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

The Section 5 Tier 2 DEIS is the fifth of six expected Tier 2 DEISs that EPA has reviewed or will review for the 142-mile-long I-69 Indianapolis to Evansville Project. Section 5 extends approximately 22 miles from State Road (SR) 37 south of Bloomington in Monroe County to SR 39 in Morgan County. The Section 5 project is an upgrade of existing SR 37 to interstate standards substantially utilizing existing multi-lane SR 37 right-of-way.

The No-build is identified and five build alternatives (Alternatives 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8) undergo detailed analysis in the DEIS. Alternative 8 is identified as the DEIS-Preferred Alternative. Alternative 8 is substantially a hybrid comprised of various components of Alternatives 4, 5, 6 and 7. Interchanges are proposed at Fullerton Pike, Tapp Road/SR45/2nd Street, SR 48/3rd Street, SR 46, Walnut Street, Sample Road, and Liberty Church Road. Currently two options have been retained for the Walnut Street Interchange: Option A (full interchange) or Option B (existing partial interchange). EPA prefers Option B because it minimizes wetland, stream and associated floodplain impacts. Overpasses would be located at Rockport Road, Vernal Pike, Arlington Road, Kinser Pike, and Chambers Pike. Local access roads and new construction to existing local roads would be provided in portions of the Section 5 corridor where driveways and other roads currently connect to existing SR 37.

Response:

Comment and preference noted. Please refer to AF002-46 for further discussion regarding Walnut Street Interchange.

AF002-02**Comment:**

Based on our review of the information in the DEIS, we believe there may be feasible modifications to Alternative 8 that have not been fully identified, assessed and/or discussed in the DEIS that may reduce impacts to resources of concern. These include providing an “emergency only” direct access to I-69 from the Hoosier Energy facility in order to reduce the extent of the proposed eastside access in order to further reduce water resource impacts in this portion (subsection 5F) of the Section 5 corridor.

EPA rates the DEIS preferred alternative as “EC-2, Environmental Concerns-Insufficient Information.” In order to fully protect the environment, there may be additional changes to Alternative 8 that have not been fully identified or assessed in the DEIS; additional information, data and analyses, and discussion should be included in the Final EIS (FEIS). An explanation of our rating system can be found in the enclosure entitled, “Summary of Rating Definitions and Follow-Up Actions.” Our detailed comments and



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

recommendations regarding the DEIS and the I-69 Section 5 project are enclosed. Our enclosed comments also include EPA's technical review of the Draft Karst Feature and Groundwater Flow Investigation Report (unredacted version) for Section 5.

The Section 5 DEIS incorporates many of the recommendations we made on the I-69 Section 4 DEIS to help inform better decision making as this project moves forward. For example, we commend the inclusion of Tables 5.21.3 and 7-2: Best Management Practices (BMPs) in Karst Terrain in the Section 5 DEIS, similar to what EPA recommended for Section 4. The tables list various karst features, BMPs that may be implemented, and a numerical cross-reference to applicable INDOT Standard Specifications. The tables could serve as the starting point from which INDOT, the Karst Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) resource agencies, and contractors may consider for implementation in order to help protect the environment and public safety.

Response:

In the Refined Preferred Alternative, the previously proposed east access road between the Walnut Street interchange and Hoosier Energy in Subsection 5D is removed and cul-de-sac provided at Connaught Road. Hoosier Energy will have access at the Sample Road interchange. This revision reduces impacts to the Waters of the US. Emergency access for Hoosier Energy is not proposed at this location due to the access availability to the north at Sample Road interchange.

Comments pertaining to the Karst MOU and BMPs are also noted.

AF002-03

Comment:

EPA Class V Permits

There will most likely be several sinkholes that would be modified for stormwater drainage for Section 5, which would be considered to be Class V wells under the Safe Drinking Water Act's Underground Injection Control (UIC) program. The DEIS correctly identifies that EPA is the agency that must be notified and would need to approve any Class V well construction. For additional information regarding EPA Class V permits and UIC program, contact Ross Micham of EPA's UIC Branch at 312/886-4237 or at micham.ross@epa.gov.

Response:

Information regarding Class V Permits has been incorporated into Chapters 5.19, 5.21, 5.23, and 7.3 of the FEIS.



AF002-04 (Response reflects consideration of IDEM 3/19/13 follow-up comments.)

Comment:

Superfund Sites

The DEIS addresses the highway drainage near the Bennett's Dump and Lemon Lane Landfill Superfund sites as EPA requested. Adding more drainage flow into the groundwater basins would negatively impact the site remedies for both Bennett's Dump and the Lemon Lane Landfill. The EPA Superfund program supports the mitigations in the preferred alternative to control drainage near the Bennett's Dump and the Lemon Lane Landfill. The EPA Superfund 2 program requests that the final Section 5 plans be made available to EPA and IDEM for review to ensure the mitigations currently proposed are addressed. The EPA Superfund contact is Thomas Alcamo, Remedial Project Manager. Tom may be reached by calling 312/886-7278 or by email at Alcamo.thomas@epa.gov.

Response:

Mitigation commitments to control I-69 roadway drainage near the Bennett's Dump and Lemon Lane Landfill to not exceed existing SR 37 roadway drainage has been added to Section 7.3, *Section 5 Mitigation Measures and Commitments*, and will be noted in the final engineer's report and design plans for Section 5. Coordination will be ongoing during the final design process with USEPA and IDEM regarding drainage flows at these Superfund sites. Design plans for construction in these areas will be developed and provided to USEPA and IDEM for review during final design. These plans will show the proposed highway drainage. INDOT will request a two week turnaround time for comment.

AF002-05 **Comment:**

Air Quality - Conformity

The document is up-to-date and correct in terms of air quality conformity requirements and the consultation that has taken place, to date, on PM2.5 hot spot requirements. We look forward to continued consultation. After December 31, 2012, Tony Maietta is EPA Region 5 Air and Radiation Division (ARD) contact for this project and may be reached by calling 312/353-8777 or by email at maietta.anthony@epa.gov.

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to AF002-26 for information regarding additional consultation and the PM2.5 hot spot analysis.



AF002-06 Comment:

Surface Water Resources

We understand that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Clean Water Act (CWA), Section 404 permitting process for Section 5 is likely to take place after FHWA issues the Record of Decision (ROD). EPA requests that FHWA/INDOT continue to coordinate all compensatory mitigation for impacts to aquatic resources with EPA throughout the NEPA process and the CWA Section 401 water quality certification/404 permitting processes. Our participation in the July 2012 site tour of potential mitigation sites for I-69 Section 5 was beneficial and productive, and we would like that to continue. The EPA Watersheds and Wetlands Branch contact is Melissa Blankenship. Melissa may be reached by calling 312/886-6833 or by email at blankenship.melissalalcpa.gov.

Response:

Detailed mitigation plans will be completed as part of the preparation of permit applications (404/401). INDOT will coordinate with regulatory agencies on the development of the Section 5 mitigation sites.

AF002-07 Comment:

Mitigation

Compensation mitigation identified in the DEIS has not advanced much from the Tier 1 documentation. We recommend the FEIS include an updated discussion of the efforts made to date for identifying compensation mitigation for Section 5 and include an up-to-date preliminary compensation mitigation plan for Section 5.

Response:

Mitigation efforts will be on-going after publication of the FEIS/ROD. The Tier 2 Section 5 BA (included in the FEIS as Appendix LL1) includes additional mitigation information for Section 5 and a summary of this information is included in Section 7.3 of the FEIS. The BA identifies 20 possible mitigation sites for Section 5 (see FEIS Section 5.20, Table 5.20-6). Seven (7) focus areas were targeted for the Section 5 mitigation: Crooked Creek Maternity Colony, Lambs Creek Maternity Colony, West Fork (Bryant Creek) Maternity Colony, Morgan Monroe State Forest, Beanblossom Bottoms Nature Preserve Maternity Colony Area, Beanblossom Creek, and Maple Grove Historic District. Environmental documents are being prepared for the mitigations sites. Mitigation site acquisition will occur after this FEIS/ROD is approved and in accordance with the Section 5 Tier 2 Biological Opinion (Appendix LL2).

AF002-08 Comment:

Summary of Overall I-69 (Indianapolis to Evansville) Project Impacts

We request the Section 5 FEIS include the updated running tally of the impacts to resources of concern of the overall I-69 Indianapolis to Evansville project. In the I-69



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

NEPA documents for Sections 2 and 3, this tally was found in Appendix ZZ and for Section 4 in Appendix KK. We continue to recommend that stream impacts and cumulative impacts to all resources of concern be added to the running tally. The DEIS indicates that a precise tally of cumulative impacts is not readily attainable. EPA suggests that at least an estimate of cumulative impacts is attainable and requests that they be included in the FEIS running tally of impacts.

Response:

The summary of overall impacts includes a comparison with Tier 1 impacts. This comparison (see FEIS Appendix MM, Tier 1 – Tier 2 Impact Comparison) provides an explanation of the variances between Tier 1 and Tier 2 estimates. In Tier 1, impacts to ephemeral streams were not evaluated, impacts to intermittent and perennial streams were quantified as the number of stream crossings, and stream impacts were not evaluated by Tier 2 section. In Tier 2, stream impacts to all classes of streams are quantified by linear feet of impacts. A comparison between Tier 1 and Tier 2 impacts cannot be made. Tallies of Tier 2 impacts of two other significant aquatic impacts (wetland impacts and floodplain impacts) are provided, along with a comparison of Tier 1 and Tier 2 impacts.

Tier 2 FEIS documents have been issued over a period of approximately six years (between 2007 and 2013). During this time span, the basis of calculating cumulative impacts has changed such that a tally of these impacts is not possible. Cumulative impacts in the FEISs for Sections 1 through 4 were calculated for the Year 2030, and were based upon the induced traffic growth associated with Version 4 of the Indiana Statewide Travel Demand Model (ISTDM). Cumulative impacts in the Section 5 FEIS are calculated for the year 2035, and are based upon the induced traffic growth associated with Version 6 of ISTDM. Cumulative impacts associated with Section 6 of the project have not been calculated either in Tier 1 or Tier 2 studies.

In addition, cumulative impacts for areas near project termini are shown in the Tier 2 FEIS documents for Section 4 and Section 5 (Section 5.24, *Indirect and Cumulative Impacts*), and adding the cumulative impacts from these adjacent FEIS documents would result in double-counting. In the case of these Section 4 and 5 FEIS documents, different model versions and different forecast years were used. These result in significantly different estimates of cumulative impacts for the same area south of Bloomington. The cumulative impacts in this area were estimated in both the Section 4 and Section 5 FEIS documents, but for different forecast years using the land use assumptions from different travel model versions.



AF002-09 (Response reflects consideration of USEPA 3/19/13 follow-up comments.)

Comment:

I-69 Mitigation Tracking and Annual Mitigation Tracking Report

The DEIS includes a brief explanation of the I-69 mitigation tracking system that INDOT is using to insure that the overall I-69 project's impacts are identified and all Tier I and Tier 2 NEPA mitigation measures as well as regulatory mitigation requirements are successfully implemented. To date, EPA has received two I-69 mitigation tracking annual reports dated, February 22, 2010 and November 17, 2011. EPA requests two hard copies and 2 DVDs of the third I-69 mitigation tracking annual report as soon as it is available.

Response:

The third mitigation tracking report was submitted to resource agencies March, 2013. USEPA acknowledged receipt of two hard copies and two DVDs in its 3/19/2013 letter.

AF002-10 **Comment:**

If you have any questions about EPA's comments, please contact Virginia Laszewski at 312-886-7501 or email her at laszewski.virginia@epa.gov. When the Section 5 FEIS is available, please send us 3 hard copies and 7 CDs, for our review.

Response:

Contact information noted. Copies of FEIS will be provided as requested.

AF002-11 **Comment:**

Chapter-SUMMARY

S.7.1 Comparison of Alternative Impacts – Section 5 is divided into six distinct geographic (south to north) subsections (5A to 5F) to aid in evaluating and comparing between the five Section 5 build alternatives (Alternatives 4,5,6,7 and 8). The DEIS Summary chapter presents a table of impacts by alternative for each geographic subsection (Tables S-3 through S-8) and Table S-9: Alternative Impact Summary by Alternatives. These tables describe impacts for such categories as: 1) costs of rights-of-way acres, 2) number of displacements of residents/businesses, 3) number of noise receptors, 4) determinations for Section 4(f) fo the Transportation Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, 5) wetland acres, 6) stream linear feet, 7) floodplain acres, 8) number of karst features and acres, 9) farmland acres, 10) managed land acres, 11) upland forest acres, and 12) core forest acres. However, these tables do not identify or present impacts to wildlife in general, federally or state-listed species, hazardous waste sites, and wellhead protection areas. This additional information would provide a more complete picture of the type and amount of resources impacted and costs associated with each subsection and each build alternative.



Reccommendation: We recommend the above-discussed tables and all Section 5 alternatives impacts summary tables be supplemented for the Final EIS (FEIS) to include impacts information for wildlife, federal and state-listed species, hazardous waste sites and wellhead protection areas.

Response:

As requested, tables have been updated in the FEIS to include impact information for cave recharge areas, hazardous material sites, and wellhead protection areas. Because this project consists of the upgrade of an existing roadway, the impacts to wildlife, and state- and federally-listed species are similar among all alternatives. Therefore, this information will be presented in Section 5.17 and 5.18 of the FEIS only, and not in the referenced tables.

AF002-12 Comment:

S.11 Mitigation – The last full paragraph on page S-69 states, “*Mitigation measures for the Indiana bat include restrictions on tree cutting between April 1 and September 30...*” Page S-67 states, “*No trees with a diameter of three or more inches will be removed between April 1 and November 15 within the Winter Action Area and April 1 and September 30 within the Summer Action Area to avoid any direct take of Indiana bats.*”

Reccommendation: We recommend the statement on page S-69 be corrected to read “*Mitigation measures for the Indiana bat include restrictions on tree cutting starting on April 1 and continuing through September 30 or November 15 in the Summer or Winter Action Areas, respectively...*” or simply “*...during defined periods...*”

Response:

The statement in Section S.11, *Mitigation*, has been reworded to avoid confusion: Mitigation measures for the Indiana bat include tree cutting restrictions. There will be no tree cutting between April 1st and September 30th within the Summer Action Area and between April 1st and November 15th in the Winter Action Area.

AF002-13 Comment:

Chapter 1.0 – BACKGROUND

1.3 Project Location and Description. Karst geology and associated karst features (e.g., sink holes, caves, etc.) in the Section 5 Study Area are important considerations when determining, in part, locations for and the design of proposed interchanges and access roads, and the handling and treatment of stormwater runoff during project construction and operation.

Reccommendation: We recommend the FEIS incorporate the three karst regions in Section 5 into the “Geologic Setting” discussion in Sub-Chapter 1.3. Additionally,



consider adding a “Geologic Setting” section and briefly describe the three karst regions or add them under the “Physiography Setting” section.

Response:

Information has been added to Section 1.3, *Project Location and Description*, as requested.

AF002-14 Comment:

Chapter 3 – ALTERNATIVES

3.5 Preferred Alternative. *Table 3-16: Section 5 – Potential Impacts of the Alternatives* includes select resource impacts for Alternatives 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. Cave impacts are not included in this table. In previous I-69 Indianapolis to Evansville project studies, as well as other transportation projects potentially affecting karst, caves garner a lot of attention.

Recommendation: Please add the potential cave impacts of the Section 5 alternatives to Table 3-16.

Response:

Information has been added to Tables 3-5 and 3-16 to include the potential impacts to caves.

AF002-15 Comment:

Chapter 4.0 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

4.2 Human Environment

4.2.2. Physical Characteristics

4.2.2.5 Community Facilities and Services – Bicycle and Pedestrian Trails (page 4.2-51).

The DEIS identifies that the local bicycle clubs would like to see more and safer crossing points at the interchanges and at grade separations for the I-69 project.

Recommendation: We recommend that INDOT continue to consult with the local bicycle clubs and the FEIS include an INDOT-required commitment that pedestrian/bicycle lanes be incorporated into select interchanges and grade separations identified as a result of this consultation.

Response:

Bicycle and pedestrian concerns identified in DEIS comments have been further coordinated with INDOT and local agencies. See Section 7.3.2, *Social and Neighborhood*, Table 7-2 for a listing of pedestrian and bicycle-related commitments included in the project.



AF002-16 Comment:

4.2.2.5 Community Facilities and Services – Wastewater (page 4.2-53).

The DEIS identifies that only the City of Bloomington, the Town of Ellettsville, and the City of Martinsville provide sanitary wastewater services. The remainder of landowners in Monroe and Morgan Counties use septic systems.

Recommendation: The FEIS should disclose whether or not Monroe and Morgan Counties have adopted “Enhanced Septic System Regulations” as recommended in the I-69 Planning Toolbox for those areas with karst geology.

Response:

EIS content has been updated to reflect the following information:

Monroe and Morgan Counties have not specifically adopted “Enhanced Septic System Regulations” as recommended in the I-69 Planning Toolbox for those areas with karst geology. Nevertheless, Monroe County has detailed septic system regulations, some of which pertain specifically to karst-sensitive areas and sinkholes. In addition, both Monroe and Morgan counties implement Indiana State Statute Rule 410 IAC 6-8.3 pertaining to residential onsite sewage systems.

These considerations are important in the context of I-69 development because human activity and pollution of karst landscapes can have a detrimental impact on water quality in areas with karst features, as well as and communities and biological systems relying on them. Failing septic systems are a potential hazard in these landscapes, and enhanced regulation of these systems is a measure outlined in the I-69 Planning Toolbox. Typically, enhanced regulations include increased minimum setbacks from sinkholes and caves, increased separation distance between septic system drainage fields and bedrock, mandatory periodic maintenance, and the reservation of an additional drainage field.

AF002-17 Comment:

4.3 Natural Environment

4.3.1 Geology

4.3.1.7 Karst and Springs (page 4.3-9). Paragraph 2 of this section reads, “*Groundwater in karst terrain is contaminated easily because surface waters are channeled rapidly into the subsurface via insurgence feature that directs surface water into the karst groundwater system (i.e. sinkholes, swallet, losing and sinking streams).*”

Recommendation: Please revise this sentence, or add clarification, so the public may readily understand the concepts of insurgence, sinkholes, swallets, and losing and



sinking streams without having to refer to the glossary when the terms are first used. Please add “insurgence features” to the glossary if this phrase is retained.

Response:

Further explanation and clarification has been added as requested.

AF002-18 Comment:

Paragraph 3 of this section states “*Unlined retention or detention structures...*”

Recommendation: To ensure readability for the public, please either explain the difference between these structures (indefinite vs. temporary holding) and add these terms to the glossary, or replace this phrase with “*Unlined runoff water holding structures...*” or something similar.

Response:

Paragraph has been revised to provide further explanation and clarification.

AF002-19 Comment

4.3.2 Water Resources

4.3.2.1 Groundwater Resources

Private Wells (page 4.3-13). The DEIS is not clear here whether FHWA and INDOT are aware that private well inventory has been conducted in connection with the Lemon Lane Landfill and the Bennett’s Dump Landfill by CBS Corporation, and that those records are public and available.

Recommendation: We recommend that FEIS acknowledge that FHWA and INDOT are aware that private well inventory has been conducted in connection with the Lemon Lane Landfill and the Bennett’s Dump Landfill by CBS Corporation, and that those records are public and available.

Response:

Information has been added as requested.

AF002-20 Comment:

Surface Water Quality (page 4.3-20). Please note that significant remediation has occurred at the Lemon Lane Landfill Superfund site. These include PCB-contaminated sediment removal in streams and associated stream banks in the Swallowhole and Quarry Springs area and upgrades to the treatment plant at the head of Clear Creek/ Illinois Central Spring (ILCS) to treat up to 6000 gpm of storm flows.



Recommendation: We recommend FHWA/INDOT include this information in the FEIS.

Response:

Information has been added as requested.

AF002-21 Comment:

4.5 Hazardous Materials

4.5.2 Potential Hazardous Waste Sites

Bennett Stone Quarry (aka Bennett’s Dump) (Page 4.5-10). Some of the information on this page regarding Bennett Stone Quarry is incorrect or needs to be updated.

Recommendation: We recommend this section on Bennett’s Stone Quarry be corrected and supplemented with the following information: 1) The site is on one parcel owned by Star Quarry Inc. None of the site is on adjacent property parcels. 2) Five springs that have low levels of PCB contamination have been identified on the Bennett’s Dump site: Mound Spring, Middle Spring, Mid-North Spring, North Spring, and Rusty Spring. 3) Slurry wall installation is no longer under consideration at this Superfund site.

Response:

Information has been updated as requested and based on further information provided in the August 2012 USEPA Third Five-Year Review Report for the Bennett Stone Quarry (USEPA, 2012). Note, the parcel owner is Ledge Wall Quarry, LLC.

AF002-22 Comment:

In the discussion of the Lemon Lane Landfill on page 4.5-9, the remedial actions are described and there is brief information included on their effectiveness. However, on page 4.5-10, while the remedial measures at Bennett Stone Quarry are described, there is no discussion of how effective they have been. This information is critical to painting a picture of the current status of the affected environment as either a contaminated area, an area that used to be contaminated but is no more, or an area whose ongoing remediation is not yet completed.

Recommendation: Please add parallel content to the discussion of remediation at Bennett Stone Quarry in the FEIS. Also, briefly discuss the effectiveness of these actions to date in preventing PCB discharges to Stout Creek.

Response:

Information has been updated as requested.



AF002-23

Comment:

Chapter 5.0 – ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

5.1 Introduction and Methodology

5.1.3 Phased Construction. The DEIS (p.5.1-12) states, *“Based upon its practices in Sections 1 through 4, INDOT will construct Section 5 in segments smaller than the overall 21 miles. However, unlike the previous Section 1 – 4, which were generally built in sequential order from start to finish, segments in Section 5 will be prioritized for construction based on several factors, including but not limited to: operational and safety needs at a particular location access for local residences and businesses with current direct access to SR 37, condition of the Existing SR 37 pavement, timing of planned construction of the local road network adjacent to the project and acquisition of necessary right-of-way in particular areas slated for construction at a given time.”*

Recommendation: The FEIS should identify each Section 5 construction segment/component and identify/discuss its construction priority status. The FEIS should include a table that lists each construction segment/component in construction priority order and include proposed start and end dates for each segment’s construction. The FEIS should also identify the proposed completion date for the entire Section 5 project.

Response:

Project sequencing and timing will be determined once the procurement process is completed. Possible construction sequencing is outlined in Appendix FF. However, INDOT is pursuing innovative finance and delivery to deliver this project to the community as quickly as possible. This approach is designed to alleviate concerns about the need for improvements to SR 37 that have been expressed by various members of the community in preparation for the opening of I-69 Section 4. The innovative finance and delivery team may offer an alternative sequencing plan for review and acceptance by INDOT.

Safety priorities, including removing at-grade crossings through the urban area, will continue to be of primary concern. Staging of capacity improvements may be prioritized based on the year improvements are needed. INDOT is ready to begin right-of-way services once the use of federal funds is authorized. I-69 Section 5 will not be constructed as a toll facility.

Since INDOT does not expend monies for innovative finance and delivery the same way it does for traditional design-build / design-bid-build projects, anticipated costs by year are not provided in the FEIS.



AF002-24 (Response reflects consideration of USEPA 3/19/13 follow-up comments.)

Comment:

5.8 Environmental Justice

5.8.4 Summary. The Summary states, “[a]fter completing further environmental justice review for Tier 2 Section 5, it was determined that none of the alternatives for Section 5 would have a disproportionately high or adverse effect on minority or low-income populations in the Section 5 Study Area.” However, a footnote found in Environmental Justice (EJ) Tables 5.8-9 through 5.8-12 discloses that “[f]inal decisions regarding displacements will be made during design and right-of-way acquisition phases. Survey of individual households/businesses would be needed to identify if displacement will be borne by minority or low-income individuals.”

Recommendation: Since it is unknown at this time which minority and/or low-income residences or businesses will be taken, we suggest it would be more accurate to say, “there is a potential for disproportionate impacts to minority and/or low-income populations due to relocations.” We also recommend the FEIS identify potential mitigation measures that could be implemented to off-set the impacts, if applicable.

Response:

The EIS analysis uses a conservative approach and the statement made in the EIS is correct. As noted on Table 5.8-12, the impact numbers are based on the total potential residential/business displacements in ACs with potential minority or low-income EJ population. Individuals who do not qualify as minority and/or low-income in these ACs have not been excluded from this total and it is very unlikely that all displacements within an AC would be borne solely by minority or low-income individuals regardless of the alternative. Therefore, the impact to minority and/or low-income populations is likely to decrease.

Additionally, Section 5.8.3.3 states that the relocation plan for all potential displacements resulting from this federally-funded project will be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Act), as amended, 49 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations) 24, and Title VI. This includes providing housing of last resort, if necessary, which would off-set impacts. Further explanation has been added to Section 5.3.4 to summarize the displacement/relocation mitigation measures described in Section 5.2.4, *Mitigation*, that would be applied to all potential displacements in accordance with the Uniform Act and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

AF002-25 **Comment:**

The DEIS 8.5.4 [5.8.4] Summary (page 5.8-22) provides the following quote: “In its comment letter on the Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) concurred ‘the initial environmental



review shows that none of the alternatives would have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority and low-income populations in the Study Area.”

Recommendation: The FEIS should either remove the above mentioned EPA quote from the 8.5.4 Summary or the FEIS should better explain why EPA’s environmental justice statement regarding the I-69 Tier 1 DEIS is applicable to a more detailed Tier 2 Section 5 environmental justice analysis.

Response:

The sentence has been revised to read: “The initial environmental justice review conducted for Tier 1 determined that none of the alternatives would have a disproportionately high or adverse effect on minority or low-income populations in the Study Area....”

AF002-26

Comment:

5.9 Air quality

Air Quality Conformity: The document is up-to-date and correct in terms of air quality conformity requirements and the consultation that has taken place on PM2.5 hot spot requirements.

As stated in the documentation (page 5.9-9), we had consultation discussions with FHWA/INDOT/Consultants about the possible need for PM2.5 hot spot analyses for intersections in Morgan County, which is nonattainment for annual PM2.5. At the time of the consultation, specific traffic data was not available for the intersections. Further consultation is required to determine which intersections are projects of air quality concern.

After December 20, 2012, all hot spot analyses must use the MOVES emissions model and quantitative analysis methodology per 75 Federal Register 79379. Projects that are of air quality concern will need a hot spot analysis consistent with EPA guidance document Transportation Conformity Guidance for Quantitative Hot-spot Analyses in PM2.5 and PM10 Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas. The guidance document can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/policy.htm#project>.

FHWA requires hot spot analyses to be completed prior to the ROD.

Recommendation: EPA recommends the FEIS include the FHWA conformity determination, discussion and supporting documentation.

After December 31, 2012, Tony Maietta is EPA Region 5 Air and Radiation Division (ARD) contact for this project and may be reached by calling 312/353-8777 or by email at maietta.anthony@epa.gov.

**Response:**

Section 5.9, *Air Quality*, describes the methodology and results of the air quality analysis conducted for Section 5 at both the regional level and the project level. Updated guidance and the MOVES emission model are incorporated into this analysis. Since the DEIS was published, the need for a quantitative PM_{2.5} analysis for I-69 Section 5 has been further discussed by the Interagency Consultation Group (ICG). It was noted that the project is located in a PM_{2.5} nonattainment area (Morgan County) with an increase in the number of diesel vehicles expected in future years. The ICG agreed that a project level hot-spot analysis would be conducted for I-69 Section 5 although the group did not conclude that the project was a Project of Air Quality Concern.

ICG meetings were held on April 19 and April 29, 2013 to obtain feedback on the methodology and analysis assumptions. A follow-up meeting was conducted on May 23, 2013 to review the preliminary version of the technical report, offer feedback, and to advance the document for public comment. A two week public comment period was offered and concluded on June 14, 2013. No comments were received during the comment period. IDEM and the USEPA have since completed their reviews in accordance with the Indiana Conformity Consultation State Implementation Plan Documentation, and FHWA finds that I-69 Section 5 conforms to all applicable project level conformity requirements. A technical report on the PM_{2.5} analysis, conformity findings, and supporting documentation are included in **Appendix OO**.

AF002-27**Comment:**

Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) (pages 5.9-14 – 5.9-15). A qualitative assessment of mobile source air toxics (MSAT) is provided in the DEIS. FHWA/INDOT *“acknowledge that some of the project alternatives may result in increased exposure to MSAT emissions in certain locations, although the concentrations and duration of exposures are uncertain, and because of this uncertainty, the health effects from these emissions cannot be estimated.”* The Bloomington urban/suburban area of Section 5 has a substantially higher population than other I-69 sections assessed so far. Exposure to diesel exhaust by construction workers and/or individuals that work, live or recreate near construction sites can have serious health implications.

Recommendation: Because MSATs can cause adverse health impacts, especially to vulnerable populations, such as children, the elderly, and those with existing respiratory health issues, EPA recommends the FEIS identify potential mitigation measures to decrease the exposure of these populations to increases in MSATs emissions during construction and operation of the proposed project. Such measures may include, but should not be limited to, strategies to reduce diesel emissions, such as project construction contracts that require the use of equipment with clean diesel engines and the use of clean diesel fuels, and limits on the length of time equipment is allowed to idle when not in active use (EPA recommends idling not exceed 5 minutes).



Response:

Potential mitigation strategies were initially added as suggested. However, subsequent review of the analysis conducted for the FEIS noted that the analysis did not suggest it was needed and/or no mitigation was planned. As a result, it was deleted.

AF002-28 (Response reflects consideration of USEPA 3/19/13 follow-up comments.)

Comment:

Greenhouse Gases/Climate Change (page 5.9-7): One brief paragraph in Section 5 DEIS is devoted to addressing greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project and climate change. The DEIS indicates that FHWA does not believe it is informative at this point to consider greenhouse gas emissions in an EIS. The DEIS goes on to identify that FHWA is actively engaged in activities with the USDOT Center for Climate Change to develop strategies to reduce transportation's contributions to greenhouse gases in particular CO₂ emissions, and to assess the risks to transportation systems and services from climate change.

Recommendation: We recommend that the FEIS estimate the project's anticipated GHG emissions and steps to minimize those emissions. We also recommend the FEIS identify and discuss any anticipated effects of climate change on the project. For example, discuss any effects that predicted increases in the number and/or intensity of precipitation events due to climate change may have on sizing bridge spans, culvert openings, and stormwater management measures in order to accommodate such events and ensure project longevity, public health, and safety.

Response:

From a policy standpoint, FHWA's current approach on the issue of global warming is as follows: To date, no national standards have been established regarding greenhouse gases, nor has EPA established criteria or thresholds for greenhouse gas emissions. On April 2, 2007, the Supreme Court issued a decision in *Massachusetts et al v. Environmental Protection Agency et al* that the USEPA does have authority under the Clean Air Act to establish motor vehicle emissions standards for CO₂ emissions. The USEPA is currently determining the implications to national policies and programs as a result of the Supreme Court decision. However, the Court's decision did not have any direct implications on requirements for developing transportation projects.

FHWA does not believe it is informative at this point to consider greenhouse gas emissions in an environmental document. The climate impacts of CO₂ emissions are global in nature. Analyzing how alternatives evaluated in an environmental document might vary in their relatively small contribution to global emissions will not better inform decisions. Further, due to the interactions between elements of the transportation system as a whole, emissions analyses would be less informative than

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

ones conducted at regional, state, or national levels. Because of these concerns, FHWA concludes that we cannot usefully evaluate CO2 emissions.

FHWA continues to be actively engaged in many other activities with the DOT Center for Climate Change to develop strategies to reduce transportation's contribution to GHGs—particularly CO2 emissions—and to assess the risks to transportation systems and services from climate change. FHWA will continue to pursue these efforts as productive steps to address this important issue. FHWA will review and update its approach to climate change at both the project and policy level as more information emerges and as policies and legal requirements evolve.

In response to USEPA's March 19, 2013 followup request, INDOT will coordinate further with FHWA during final design to determine if adaptation plans that USDOT and others are in the process of finalizing at this time can be factored into final design for Section 5. Updated language has also been added in the FEIS for GHG. This includes background information on GHG, project-specific VMT information, statewide VMT numbers from MOVES2010b, statewide Indiana emissions, potential change that the project will have on CO2 emissions, and suggested mitigation strategies.

Drainage-related project design elements (e.g. drainage calculations, culvert sizes, bridge lengths) are determined using the adopted provisions of the Indiana Design Manual (IDM). In turn, the IDM provides for use of data from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to determine the size and frequency of rainfall events. To the extent that climate trends lead to changes in precipitation patterns, the use of baseline NOAA data provides for these trends to be reflected in drainage designs.

AF002-29 Comment:**5.16 Hazardous Waste Sites****5.16.3.2 Superfund Sites**

The last full sentence in the last paragraph on page 5.16-4 states, "*The combined treatment systems are expected to treat nearly 100% of the ILCS spring water and to treat 99.9% of the PCB mass from the receiving stream.*" The preceding text says that the treatment plant captures water discharging from the ILCS and removes PCBs before the spring water enters surface water. There is no mention of surface water from the receiving stream being treated. Should the sentence quoted above read "...and to prevent 99.9% of the PCB mass from entering the receiving stream"?

Recommendation: Please revise the text discussed above to better clarify the intended meaning. Note that the same text appears on page 5.21-23, paragraph 2, and should be revised in that location as well.

Response:

Clarification added as requested.



AF002-30 Comment:

On page 5.16-5, at the end of the third paragraph, the DEIS states, “updates from the upcoming release of the 5-year review will be included.” The 5-year review was released in August 2012, likely after the content of this Section 5 DEIS was finalized.

Recommendation: Please update this discussion in the FEIS to include the findings of this review.

Response:

Information pertaining to the 5-year review has been added to the Bennett Stone Quarry discussion in Section 5.16.3.2, *Superfund Sites*.

AF002-31 Comment:

5.16.5 Summary (Hazardous Waste Sites)

Table 5.16-1 Summary of Hazardous Waste Sites summarizes suggested mitigation measures, which include: 1) for the ILCS as impacted by the Lemon Lane Landfill, “prevent highway drainage from entering ILCS recharge/treatment area; divert west to Stout Creek,” and 2) for the Bennett Stone Quarry, “prevent highway drainage from entering Bennett groundwater area by diverting either upstream or downstream of site to Stout Creek.”

The Tier 2 DEIS addresses the highway drainage near the Bennett’s Dump and Lemon Lane Landfill Superfund sites. Adding additional drainage into the groundwater basins would negatively impact the site remedies for both Bennett’s Dump and the Lemon Lane Landfill. The EPA Superfund program supports the mitigations in the preferred alternative to control drainage near the Bennett’s Dump and the Lemon Lane Landfill. The EPA Superfund program requests that the final Section 5 plans be made available to EPA and IDEM for review to ensure the mitigations proposed by Tier 2 DEIS are addressed. The EPA Superfund contact is Thomas Alcamo, Remedial Project Manager. Tom may be reached by calling 312/866-7278 or by email at Alcamo.thomas@epa.gov.

Recommendation: The EPA Superfund program requests that the final Section 5 plans be made available to EPA and IDEM for review to ensure the mitigations proposed by Tier 2 Draft Environmental Impact Statement are addressed.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-04 response.

AF002-32 Comment:

EPA supports the general concept of diverting additional highway runoff from entering the Wedge Quarry complex where the passive drain has been installed to lower



groundwater levels at the Bennett’s Dump site. However, it is not apparent how such a diversion can be constructed. One possibility may be the diversion of runoff into Stout’s Creek upstream of the passive drain and the Bennett’s Dump site.

Recommendation: We recommend the FEIS discuss the feasibility of diverting runoff into Stout’s Creek upstream of the passive drain and the Bennett’s Dump site. In addition, potential impacts to Stout’s Creek from such a diversion should be discussed and potential mitigation measures to avoid or reduce impacts to Stout Creek identified in the FEIS.

Response:

Language is included in regards to potential mitigation measures in Section 7.3.17, *Karst*, of the FEIS. The intent of this statement is to avoid adding additional drainage to the northwest quadrant of the existing SR 46 interchange towards the Bennett’s Dump site and to use the existing highway drainage system where possible. It may not involve the construction of a diversion structure. A meeting was conducted with INDOT, USEPA, IDEM, and consultant staff to review the project and mitigation measures at this site on March 4, 2013. Additionally, design plans for construction in this area will be provided to USEPA and IDEM for review as discussed in AF002-04 response.

AF002-33

Comment:

5.17 Bald Eagles, Federal and State Threatened and Endangered Species

5.17.3.3 State-Listed Species

This section provides a species-by-species description of each state-listed species, their habitat, and potential impacts. DEIS Section 11.4 – Agency Review and Coordination only mentions the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) input to this part of the assessment as related to the box turtle.

Recommendation: For the FEIS, please update this section to also summarize IDNR concurrence or revision recommendations on the DEIS impact analysis for state-listed species, including the cave-dwelling invertebrates for which considerable survey efforts were made.

Response:

Language has been added to reflect that the most updated state list supplied from IDNR through agency coordination to verify cave-dwelling invertebrates identified during the surveys. On April 26, 2012, BLA provided GIS shapefiles of the I-69 Section 5 preliminary alternatives 4, 5, 6 and 7 to the IDNR for a Natural Heritage Database request. On May 1, 2012, IDNR provided a GIS shapefile of threatened, endangered, and rare species with records within 0.5 mile of the alternatives. These species are discussed in Chapter 5.17. Additional threatened and endangered species (not included in the shapefile) are also discussed in Chapter 5.17 based on the habitat present and the results of specialized studies such as bat mist netting and karst biota surveys. Description of this coordination



has been added to FEIS Section 11.4.2, *Agency Coordination*, and included in Appendix C.

AF002-34 (Response reflects consideration of USEPA 3/19/13 follow-up comments.)

Comment:

5.19 Water Resources

5.19.2 Surface Waters

Seven intermittent stream segments and twelve ephemeral steam segments are identified as Class III Primary Headwater Habitat (PHWH) with the highest quality and potential to support a diverse array of flora/fauna (Table 5.19-13 Potential Stream Impacts and Potential Stream Relocation Lengths by Alternative, pages 5.19-53 to 5.19-73). According to the Field Evaluation Manual for Ohio's Primary Headwater Habitat Streams 2012, Class III PHWH streams are perennial streams in which the prevailing flow and temperature conditions are influence by groundwater. They exhibit moderately diverse to highly diverse communities of cold water adapted native fauna². The DEIS does not explain how application of Ohio's methodology translates to Indiana's headwater streams.

Recommendation: We recommend the FEIS explain how the application of Ohio's methodology translates to Indiana's headwater streams.

Response:

The use of the Ohio Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index was reviewed by the Interagency Water Resource Team, which included USEPA, for use on the I-69 project to assess all stream channels that did not meet the criteria for the Quality Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI). This was determined at the Team's meeting of February 23, 2005; see FEIS Appendix C, *Agency Coordination Correspondence*, for the meeting summary. The HHEI is being used as a method to determine the stream quality of the smaller headwater streams using the criteria to rate these streams as poor, fair, or good. Further explanation has been added to Section 5.19.2.2 of the FEIS.

AF002-35 Comment:

All practicable alternatives must be explored to avoid impacts to natural streams and their riparian corridors to the maximum extent possible in accordance with the Clean Water Act (CWA) 404 (b)(1) Guidelines. If impacts are absolutely unavoidable, every effort must be made to maintain and/or replicate the quality of the resource that is impacted.

² http://www.epa.ohio.gov/portals/35/wqs/headwaters/PHWHManual_2012.pdf

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

INDOT’s analysis considers a riparian zone to be any forested area that is adjacent to the stream within 100 feet on either side of the stream centerline. Rationale needs to be provided regarding why the riparian zone is restricted to 100 feet on either side. Further, the text suggests that it is only considered a riparian zone if it is forested.

Recommendation: We recommend the FEIS provide an explanation as to why the riparian zone is restricted to 100 feet. In addition, the FEIS should also clarify what constitutes a riparian zone.

Response:

This methodology for calculating the riparian impacts has been used in Sections 1-4. In the Section 1 FEIS this can be found on Page 5-311. To remain consistent between the six sections this methodology has been utilized in Section 5. The 100 foot riparian zone was determined based upon information in the Habitat Management Sheet for Riparian Zones published by the Indiana Division of Fish and Wildlife in October 2004. It states, “Depending on the size and slope of the floodplain, riparian corridors should be at least 50 to 100 feet in width on each side of the watercourse to adequately address wildlife and water quality needs.” The FEIS includes this explanation in Section 5.19.2.3, *Analysis (Potential Stream and Riparian Impacts)*.

AF002-36**Comment:**

According to the DEIS, INDOT commits to continue to coordinate with both USACE and IDEM during the CWA Section 401 and CWA Section 404 permitting processes regarding the proposed stream mitigation (page 7-34) and throughout the development of the proposed mitigation sites that will be offered for compensatory mitigation (page 5.19-79). EPA strongly recommends that INDOT continue to coordinate all compensatory mitigation for impacts to aquatic resources with USEPA through this process and the Section 401/404 permitting process. Our participation in the July 2012 site tour of potential mitigation sites for I-69 Section 5 was beneficial and productive, and we would like that to continue.

Recommendation: EPA requests that FHWA/INDOT continue to coordinate all compensatory mitigation for impacts to aquatic resources with EPA throughout the NEPA process and the CWA Section 401 water quality certification and Section 404 permitting processes. EPA recommends the FEIS Summary and Chapter 7 – Mitigation include a commitment by INDOT to include EPA throughout the development of the Section 5 proposed mitigation sites for impacts to aquatic resources.

Response:

Detailed mitigation plans will be completed as part of the preparation of permit applications (404/401). Clarification has been added to Chapter 7, stating that INDOT will coordinate with regulatory agencies, including USEPA, on the development of the Section 5 mitigation sites.

**AF002-37** **Comment:**

5.19.2.4 Mitigation – Wetlands, Open Water, Rivers and Streams (pages 5.19-82 to 5.19-81). The DEIS does not identify the specific measures that INDOT will use to ensure that the applicable standard specifications and/or special provisions will be successfully implemented by the design and/or construction contractor in a timely fashion. Such measures might include, but need not be limited to, requiring an independent environmental monitor with authority to stop construction if adequate sediment and erosion control measures are not being implemented and properly maintained. INDOT construction contracts could include a provision to levy substantial monetary fines when a contractor fails to properly implement appropriate construction BMPs to protect surface and ground water quality. We are aware the INDOT established such accountability measures for its contractors on the Louisville Bridges project.

Recommendation: The FEIS should identify and discuss the specific measures INDOT will take to help ensure that their construction contractors follow their construction standard specification and/or special provisions.

Response:

All construction contracts in the I-69 Section 4 project include the identification of at least one full-time INDOT inspector to solely be responsible for erosion and sediment control compliance, in addition, INDOT has identified an erosion and sediment control technical field reviewer to assist in erosion and sediment control compliance on all active construction contracts in Section 4. INDOT has also hired an independent consultant to assist in the compliance inspections for erosion and sediment control in Section 4. There are also specific “Quality Adjustments” identified in all active construction contracts in Section 4 that contain specific adjustments to contractor payments if erosion and sediment control items are not performing appropriately. Comparable provisions will be incorporated into construction contracts for I-69 Section 5. A mitigation commitment has been added to FEIS Section 7.3.4, *Construction*, that INDOT will complete contractor compliance inspections on a regular basis to help control erosion and sediment on the project.

AF002-38 **(Response reflects consideration of IDEM 3/19/13 follow-up comments.)****Comment:****5.19.3.3 Analysis**

Groundwater Quality (pages 5.19-88 and 5.19-89, last sentence): In general, EPA appreciates that the following statement is made here and elsewhere in the DEIS: “*Per USEPA written comments on the Section 4 DEIS, a firm commitment has been made that if active groundwater flow paths are discovered, measures will be taken to perpetuate the flow and protect water quality.*” However, please heed the following recommendation.



Recommendation: EPA requests that INDOT commit to consulting with the EPA Superfund Project Manager prior to making any decisions regarding I-69 project manipulation of groundwater flow paths that might impact the Lemon Lane and/or Bennetts Dump superfund sites.

Response:

INDOT recognizes the importance of avoiding changes to groundwater or surface water flow paths associated with these superfund sites in regards to potentially invalidating on-going studies at these sites. As such, INDOT will coordinate with the USEPA Superfund Project Manager and IDEM if groundwater flow paths are anticipated to be impacted in areas of Lemon Lane and/or Bennetts Dump superfund sites. Design plans for construction in this area will be provided to USEPA and IDEM for review as discussed in AF002-04 response.

AF002-39 (Response reflects consideration of IDEM 3/19/13 follow-up comments.)

Comment:

5.21 Karst Impacts

There will most likely be several sinkholes that would be modified for stormwater drainage for Section 5, which would be considered to be Class V wells under the Safe Drinking Water Act's Underground Injection Control (UIC) program. The DEIS correctly identifies that EPA is the agency that must be notified and would need to approve any Class V well construction. However, the DEIS does not specifically identify the karst features that could be considered Class V wells.

Recommendation: We recommend that FEIS identify the types of karst feature/s (e.g., sinkholes) that could be expected to be encountered within Section 5 that if modified for stormwater drainage would be considered Class V Injection wells.

Response:

As requested, Section 5.21.4, *Mitigation*, has been modified to identify the types of features which would be considered Class V injection wells. Most of the Class V well permits anticipated within Section 5 would be authorized by rule because there will be measures in place to prevent contamination as part of sinkhole mitigation under the Karst MOU. IDEM will be provided the opportunity to review sinkhole mitigation measures in accordance with the Karst MOU.

AF002-40 Comment:

5.21.3.4 Karst Impacts by Alternative

The DEIS states "*For the purposes of the following discussions, the term "impact" means that portions of a karst feature are located within the rights-of-ways of the Section 5 alternatives.*" The text and table that precede this section references studies and expert



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

determinations related to the hydrologic connection of karst features and areas outside of the Section 5 corridor, as summarized in Table 5.21-1 under the column “*Relevant Karst **Outside of Section 5 Corridor.*” However, the line quoted above seems to indicate that only features within the corridor, approximately 1/3 of the total relevant karst area, are considered when comparing impacts among the alternatives.

Recommendation: Please correct this description of the approach to impact analysis (note that the “Relevant Karst Area” rows in Table 5.21-2 provide more points of comparison than are indicated in the quoted sentence).

Response:

Clarification has been added as requested: Impacts to relevant karst that may not have discernible surface expression for karst feature identification were also included in the impacts within the Section 5 right-of-way (see Tables 5.21-1 and 5.21-4). Relevant karst outside of the Section 5 alternatives’ right-of-way was not included in the karst impacts by alternative. In accordance with the Karst MOU, potential impacts outside of the alternative right-of-way will be subject to subsequent review in final design and addressed as part of Best Management Practices and mitigation implementation, in coordination with the Karst MOU signatory agencies.

AF002-41

Comment:

Paragraph 2 of this section states “Existing SR 37 was constructed in the 1970’s and includes right-of-way that accounts for at least more than 50% of the karst impacts included in the five alternatives.”

Recommendation: Please clarify whether SR 37 accounts for at least or more than 50% of the impacts.

Response:

SR 37 accounts for at least 50% of the impacts. Clarified text is provided in Section 5.21.3.4, *Karst Impacts by Alternative*.

AF002-42

Comment:

5.21.3.7 Potential Impacts upon Threatened and Endangered Species and Cave Biota. The DEIS states (page 5.21-29), “*The fauna identified in the 2005 biological survey ... have become conditioned to the residential and transportation land use after more than 40 years of influence. Therefore, the project should not result in such changes of a sufficient magnitude to adversely affect the identified state-listed species.*” Similar statements appear in the impact assessment for the troglobitic crayfish (*Orconectes inermis testii*), a state-listed rare species, in Section 5.17 (page 5.17-25). However, this conclusion is not adequately supported by either observation or analysis, and the pollutant loading analysis (described below) seems to contradict the conclusion.



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

On the page after this conclusion is presented, Section 5.21.3.8 (page 5.21-30) addresses the predicted pollutant loading during construction to the karst system, by predicting that a past pattern in the same area would be repeated: “*there were elevated levels of total suspended solids (TSS) and total recoverable metals (TRM) for arsenic, copper, lead, and zinc to the subsurface associated with the during-construction activities for the SR 37 project. These levels returned to pre-construction conditions about two years after construction. This pattern is anticipated for the I-69 construction.*” Neither Section 5.21 nor Appendix Y – Draft Karst Report (Section 3.6.1, where this study is described in slightly more detail) state how high these elevated concentrations were during the SR 37 project’s construction phase, providing no quantitative basis for the conclusion presented.

Moreover, the analysis in Appendix L of the Draft Karst Report (DEIS Appendix Y), and summarized in Table 9 (page 80 of the Draft Karst Report), indicates that pollutant concentrations to which these aquatic cave biota are exposed would approximately double for lead and mercury, and would increase by approximately 50% for copper and cadmium, and by 10% for total nitrogen. That page very briefly states that the predicted concentrations “*exceed the applicable water quality standards.*” Tables 2-1 through 2-8 in Appendix L of the Draft Karst Report (DEIS Appendix Y) clearly show that both the current and predicted concentrations of these pollutants exceed the acute and chronic aquatic criteria, as indicated by the cells shaded in red.

Recommendation: The quantitative details of the pollutant loading analysis and its implications for potential impact to cave-dwelling aquatic species should be discussed in Section 5.21.3.7. If the aquatic criteria referenced in Tables 2-1 through 2-8 in Appendix L of the Draft Karst Report (DEIS Appendix Y) are not clearly applicable to these species, then we recommend additional criteria or ecotoxicity data be identified and compared to the estimated concentrations.

Response:

The cave biota discussed in Section 5.21, *Karst Impacts*, were found in caves where a significant portion of the drainage area has experienced residential, commercial, and transportation development. Existing SR 37 (constructed in the early 1970’s) currently passes over the cave’s recharge area. The biota were sampled by Dr. Julian Lewis in 2005, approximately 30 years after SR 37 was constructed (refer to Appendix J of the *Final Karst Report [Redacted]* in Appendix Y of the FEIS). Based on his assessment, the cave’s biological community appeared to be in relatively good health at the time of the field investigation despite the presence of SR 37 and historical development. Dr. Lewis reported that this cave ranked 9th highest for biological significance out of 484 Indiana caves.

When discussing the results of the SR 37 Study (“Results of MOU-Related Karst Studies for Indiana State Road 37, Lawrence County, Indiana (1992-1995)”, it is acknowledged that the determination and installation of karst drainage structures for the SR 37 project was done when construction had already begun, allowing less time for planning and



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

design. Therefore, some drainage structures, and associated detention basins, were not designed to handle the correct amount of runoff capacity. Some additional sinkhole excavation was needed to increase the size of the drainage structure and/or detention basin. This sinkhole excavation, done during the road construction, contributed to higher levels of TSS. The SR 37 Study states, when speaking of the temporary increases in pollutant loadings, “This is not likely to be a problem for future construction projects that are fully carried out within the MOU framework” (Page 66). The strategy to avoid subsurface contamination of TSS and TRM will be contained in the Erosion Control Plan and fulfillment of the Rule 5 requirements. Erosion Control standards and specifications have changed and improved since the SR 37 project. A mitigation commitment has been added to FEIS Section 7.3, *Section 5 Mitigation Measures and Commitments*, requiring the designer to abide by item B1 of the Erosion Control Plan Development, which states:

“This item is included in the rule to place an emphasis on identification of pollutants that are associated with construction activity. In the past, the emphasis has been on sediment reduction; however the rule requires the plan preparer to identify other potential pollutants and their sources. Potential pollutant sources include material and fuel storage areas, fueling locations, exposed soils, leaking vehicles and equipment, etc.

To satisfy this item, the plan needs to contain a written description of the expected pollutants that could enter Storm water during the construction operation, and where those potential pollutants might be generated. In addition, the plan preparer should include discussion of measures or operational activities that will be initiated to minimize the danger of pollutants entering Storm water.” (<http://www.in.gov/idem/4909.htm>).

The pollutant loading calculations represent estimates of pollutant loads. Several assumptions had to be made to conduct this analysis at early stages of the project design. These assumptions overestimated the pollutant loads and are acknowledged in the *Final Karst Report (Redacted)* (Appendix Y of the FEIS). For example, it is assumed that the entire length of right-of-way within the feature drainage area drains directly into an opening in the feature. In many cases, this is highly unlikely. For instance, if a karst feature is located on the backslope of a ditch along the southbound lane, there is no guarantee that highway runoff from the median or ditch along the northbound lane would drain to the karst feature. Also, where multiple karst features are located within the same right-of-way drainage area, the pollutant loading calculation for each feature assumed no run off would drain into the other features. In all likelihood, the karst features would share the runoff volumes. Finally, the roadside and median ditches are designed for conveyance and outlet into streams and creeks, not into karst features such as sinkholes or swallets. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that runoff would not find its way to a feature, instead traveling along the ditch grades and culverts as



designed and constructed. The pollutant loading calculation assumed the entire right-of-way would drain into the karst feature, and not be conveyed elsewhere.

In addition to karst feature avoidance and runoff treatment, the diversion of road runoff away from sensitive karst groundwater systems is included in the mitigation recommendations. Recommendations to treat runoff that would be directed to this cave system are stated in Section 5.21 including: an engineered wetland sediment/containment reduction system; linear peat sand filters and or vegetated swales; sinkhole sediment and containment traps; runoff and storm water detention/retention systems, treatment and infiltration galleries; and control of first flush volumes with designed overflow into natural drainage. These treatment options are not incorporated into the pollutant loading analysis. The methodology assumes no treatment.

Based on up-front planning associated with the Karst MOU and improved erosion control standards and specifications, it is anticipated that TSS levels will be lower and return faster to preconstruction levels than those experienced during the SR 37 study referenced above.

Information above has been summarized and included in Section 5.21, *Karst Impacts*. INDOT is not aware of specific ecotoxicity studies for the cave biota species to compare to the estimated pollutant load concentrations. However, based on the assumptions above it is likely these pollutant loads and concentration estimates are substantially higher than what will occur.

AF002-43 **Comment:**

5.21.4 Mitigation. We note that a firm commitment has been added for Section 5 that if active groundwater flow path are discovered, measures will be taken to perpetuate the flow and protect ground water quality, as EPA requested for Section 4.

We commend the inclusion of *Tables 5.21.3 and 7-2: Best Management Practices (BMPs) in Karst Terrain* in the Section 5 DEIS, similar to what EPA recommended for Section 4. The tables list various karst features, BMPs that may be implemented, and a numerical cross-reference to applicable INDOT Standard Specifications. The tables could serve as the starting point from which INDOT, the Karst Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) resource agencies, and contractors may consider BMPs for implementation in order to help protect the environment and public safety.

Response:

Comment noted.



AF002-44

Comment:

5.24 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts

The DEIS asserts that indirect impacts to water quality from wetland and stream impacts would be negligible because construction will be governed by the use of INDOT Standard Specifications, Special Provisions, and the IDEM Stormwater Quality Manual (pages 5.24-40, 5.24-42, and 5.19-80). However, the DEIS does not explain how this will be done. This needs to be fleshed out more in the FEIS as it is a critical to understanding of the potential cumulative and indirect impacts of this project.

Recommendation: The FEIS should include a discussion regarding how existing hydrology and ecological functions would be maintained in portions of wetlands and streams not directly impacted by construction activities within the ROW. As an example, in areas where portions of wetlands/wetland complexes would be directly impacted and the remainder of the wetland/wetland complex is directly abutting construction areas, explain how the functions and values of the avoided areas will be maintained.

Recommendation: In order to avoid and minimize indirect impacts to streams and wetlands/wetland complexes during construction and operation, we recommend FHWA/INDOT consider developing for inclusion in the FEIS/ROD, a BMPs/INDOT Standard Specification/IDEM Stormwater Quality Manual table similar to DEIS *Table 7.2: Best Management Practices (BMPs) in Karst Terrain* (pages 7-56 through 7-59). The wetlands and streams table/s would list the various stream and wetland scenarios found in the Section 5 study area, identify the corresponding potential BMPs that could be undertaken to protect the wetland and/or stream from indirect impacts, provide the citation to the corresponding INDOT Standards Specification/s or page in the IDEM Stormwater Quality Manual where the BMP/s is/are found. This type of table would be a good starting point for INDOT/IDEM/Contractors to consider when deciding which BMPs to require/use during project construction in order to avoid and minimize indirect impacts to wetlands and streams in the Section 5 study area.

Response:

The existing hydrology will be maintained through the project and it is anticipated that the hydrology/ecological functions of non-impacted wetlands or portions of remaining wetlands will be maintained similar to preconstruction conditions. All culverts will be sumped to provide natural substrate to fill in the culverts and provide sediment transport similar to preconstruction conditions to reduce impacts to sand/gravel/cobble bottom streams flowing through the project. Many of the wetland areas being affected by the project are already dissected by the SR 37 right-of-way; therefore, the expansion of the SR 37 to an interstate is not anticipated to cause any additional impacts from a hydrology and ecological functions perspective to the wetland areas that will remain after the I-69 project is completed. In addition, wetland areas outside the construction limits will have do not disturb sign placed around them to prevent disturbance.

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

INDOT will follow the INDOT Design Manual or the IDEM Stormwater Quality Manual, whichever is more stringent, on maintaining erosion and sediment control to prevent secondary impacts to water resources from runoff of the project. Both of these manuals contain language that specifically identifies what measure and design criteria for each measure for each situation. These manuals contain the necessary measures to be used in all situations that are anticipated to arise from the construction of the I-69 Section 5 project; therefore, there is no need to have a separate table in the FEIS that identifies these measures for each anticipated situation. The construction contracts for the I-69 project identify the use of both of these documents to address erosion and sediment control during construction of the project. Construction contracts will further state that in areas of overlap of these two documents, the more intensive measure must be used. The proper installation and maintenance of erosion and sediment control measures will reduce the risk of indirect impacts to wetlands and/or streams outside the project limits. In addition, INDOT has been requiring the contractor to place signs on all jurisdictional channels prior to beginning construction activities to identify these channels to construction workers so all construction workers will know where the jurisdictional channels are located to reduce impacts from construction activities at the jurisdictional channel locations. INDOT has also assigned personnel to monitor contractor compliance with erosion and sediment control. INDOT has worked with IDEM to assign an erosion and sediment control technical advisor from IDEM specifically assigned to I-69 to help address erosion and sediment control concerns and work with INDOT Project Engineers to enforce proper installation and maintenance of erosion and sediment control measures on the I-69 project. These added positions along with specifically defined penalties “Quality Adjustments” for not implementing and/or maintaining appropriate erosion and sediment control measures on the project will reduce the indirect impacts caused by construction activities associated with the I-69 project.

AF002-45 Comment:**Chapter 6.0 – COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Eastern Access Road (Subsection 5D) – The DEIS is not clear why the entire length of the currently proposed eastern access road in subsection 5D is needed. Why does the eastern access road need to provide access to two (Walnut Street and Sample Road), instead of one proposed I-69 interchange area? We had previously requested that INDOT assess the feasibility of providing an emergency-only access to I-69 for Hoosier Energy in order to shorten the eastern access road in order to reduce impacts in Subsection 5D. The DEIS does not identify and assess an I-69 emergency-only direct access for Hoosier Energy and shortened eastern access road as a possible option.

Recommendation: In order to determine whether natural resources impacts can be further reduced, we recommend that INDOT/FHWA assess the feasibility of installing an emergency-use-only direct access to I-69 for Hoosier Energy in order to reduce the length of the eastern access road needed in Subsection 5D. This assessment, along with impacts information, should be included in the FEIS.



Response:

Please refer to AF002-02 response.

AF002-46

Comment:

Walnut Street Interchange (Subsection 5D) – EPA finds the use of the existing partial interchange at Walnut Street (Alternative 8, Option B) preferable to construction to a fully directional interchange on new facilities (Alternative 8, Option A) because it would minimize impacts to wetlands, streams and associated floodplain areas. In addition, it is not clear if a partial interchange is a feasible interchange option here since FHWA has not yet determined whether approval would be given for a partial interchange at this location.

Recommendation: The FEIS should include FHWA’s partial interchange determination for the Walnut Street Interchange.

Response:

The Refined Preferred Alternative includes maintaining the existing partial interchange at Walnut Street. The FHWA determination, along with supporting documentation, is included in Appendix RR, *Walnut Street Interchange Selection Report*.

AF002-47

Comment:

Chapter 7 – MITIGATION and COMMITMENTS

Compensation mitigation efforts for wetland, stream and forest impacts identified in the DEIS have not advanced much from the Tier 1 documentation. However, we are aware that additional work regarding potential compensation mitigation sites has taken place since Tier 1.

Recommendation: We recommend the FEIS include an up-dated discussion of the efforts made to date for identifying compensation migration for unavoidable impacts in Section 5 and include an up-to-date preliminary compensation mitigation plan for Section 5.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-07 response.

AF002-48

Comment:

7.3 Section 5 Mitigation Measures and Commitments

7.3.7 Hazardous Materials – Sites for Specific Measures (page 7-29):

The EPA Superfund program supports the mitigation measures in the preferred alternative to control drainage near the Bennett’s Dump and the Lemon Lane Landfill.



The EPA Superfund program requests that the final Section 5 plans be made available to EPA and IDEM for review to ensure the mitigations proposed by Tier 2 Draft Environmental Impact Statement are addressed. The EPA Superfund contact is Thomas Alcamo, Remedial Project Manager. Tom may be reached by calling 312/886-7278 or by email at Alcamo.thomas@epa.gov.

Recommendation: The EPA Superfund program requests that the final Section 5 plans be made available to EPA and IDEM for review to ensure the mitigations proposed by Tier 2 DEIS are addressed.

Response:

INDOT will provide design plans to USEPA and IDEM Superfund contacts for the Lemon Lane Landfill and Bennett's Dump Superfund site areas when drainage details have been developed for coordination and verification of project commitments. INDOT will request a two week turnaround time for comment..

AF002-49

Comment:

Section 7.3.4 Construction

#4 Air Quality (page 7-20) and #17 Equipment Maintenance (page 7-22):

The Bloomington urban/suburban area of Section 5 is a fairly populated I-69 section. Exposure to diesel exhaust by construction workers and/or individuals that work, live or recreate near construction sites can have serious health implications.

Recommendation: In order to protect air quality in the project area during construction, we recommend INDOT consider additional strategies to reduce diesel emissions, such as project construction contracts that require the use of equipment with clean diesel engines and the use of clean diesel fuels, and limits on the length of time equipment is allowed to idle when not in active use (EPA recommends idling not exceed 5 minutes).

Response:

Please refer to AF002-27 response.

AF002-50

Comment:

11. Heavy Blasting (pages 7-21 and 7-22). The few measures identified here seem to address only caves with bat populations. It is possible that caves without bats could also be affected by blasting. Shouldn't there be some initial limits on peak particle velocity or minimum radius from the blast site to a cave location?

Recommendation: Please include a discussion in the FEIS of blasting limitations that have been used on other karst highway or building projects.



Response:

A specification for blasting operations was specifically developed for the karst portion of Section 4 of the I-69 project. The specification was developed to protect karst and limestone resources. The specification limits peak particle velocity and requires monitoring and the development of a quality control plan.

Blasting is not anticipated within the Cave A recharge area.

AF002-51

Comment:

7.3.9 Wetland Impacts (pages 7-31 and 7-32), 7.3.12 Water Body Modifications (pages 7-34 to 7-36), and 7.3.14 Water Quality Impacts – (pages 7-38 and 7-39). EPA appreciates that FHWA/INDOT have to date coordinated on compensatory mitigation for impacts to aquatic resources.

Recommendation: EPA recommends the FEIS Summary and Chapter 7 – Mitigation include a commitment by INDOT to include EPA throughout the development of the Section 5 proposed mitigation sites for impacts to aquatic resources. We request that FHWA/INDOT coordinate with us throughout the NEPA process and the CWA Section 401 water quality certification and CWA Section 404 permitting process.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-06 response.

AF002-52

Comment:

7.3.14 Water Quality Impacts (pages 7-38 and 7-39). The Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index (HHEI) is a relatively rapid habitat evaluation procedure. Similarly, the Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI) is a method for evaluating stream habitat quality. The QHEI and HHEI alone do not tell the full story about potential impacts to water quality. To achieve a more robust understanding of the baseline conditions of streams and potential water quality impacts resulting from impacts to the streams, biological and chemical data should be collected and analyzed along with the physical habitat data.

Recommendation: Please consider the recommendation in our September 13, 2012, letter providing comments on INDOT's Section 5 Draft Tour Summary that existing aquatic resources located at potential compensatory mitigation sites be identified and assessed as early as possible in the process so that we may better understand the baseline conditions of these sites.

Recommendation: Hydrology studies should also be performed on the potential mitigation sites as recommended by IDEM during the July 2012 tour.



Response:

Please refer to AF002-34 response above for evaluation of stream impacts comment.

INDOT is completing additional hydrology studies on the proposed wetland mitigation sites as proposed during the Section 5 Mitigation Site Tour. This additional hydrology data will be incorporated into the Mitigation and Monitoring Plans included in the 404/401 permit application packages.

AF002-53 Comment:

7.3.17 Karst. We commend the inclusion of *Tables 5.21.3 and 7.2: Best Management Practices (BMPs) in Karst Terrain* in Section 5 DEIS. The tables list various karst features, BMPs that may be implemented, and a numerical cross-reference to applicable INDOT Standard Specifications. The tables could serve as the starting point from which INDOT, the Karst Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) resource agencies, and contractors may consider BMPs for implementation in order to help protect the environment and public safety.

Response:

Comment noted.

AF002-54 Comment:

EPA Technical Adequacy Review of the I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies – DRAFT Karst Feature and Groundwater Flow Investigation Report, Section 5, SR 37 south of Bloomington to SR 39, Confidential Information, dated October 2012.

[Note: a redacted version of the Draft Karst Report is included in Appendix Y of the Section 5 DEIS.]

For the most part, the karst report is thorough and well presented. The Section 5 karst report addresses most of the comments EPA generated regarding the I-69 Section 4 karst report regarding the lack of defined mitigation alternatives and bias sampling. The graphics appear to present the field data and findings in a clear and concise manner. Our specific Draft Karst Report comments follow.

Response:

Comment noted. Responses to specific comments follow.



AF002-55 Comment:

1.0 Introduction

On page 12, the report uses several specific geologic terms or adjectives when describing the limestone.

Recommendation: Please add micritic, pellatal, bioclastic, calcarenite, and calcareous to the glossary as Geologic Terms.

Response:

Terms have been added to glossary as requested.

AF002-56 Comment:

1.5.2 Bloomington North and Simpson Chapel Karst

On page 13, the report states, “[t]he loess was deposited during the Pleistocene Age (Gates, 1962) and is highly erodible and prone to the formation of soil pipes.”

Recommendation: We recommend that the above statement regarding loess may be better stated as “...is highly erodible and subject to soil piping or soil migration.”

Response:

Language has been revised as requested.

AF002-57 Comment:

6.0 Recommendations

In Section 6.1, Best Management Practices, as well as in the **Executive Summary**, it is stated that “Procedures to reduce the impacts to karst will be implemented in accordance with INDOT Standard Specifications and the 1993 Karst MOU...” Unless BMPs have been adopted in the last year, there are no karst specific BMPs or mitigation alternatives in the INDOT Standard Specifications.

Recommendation: We suggest amending the above statement as follows: “Procedures to reduce the impacts to karst will be implemented in accordance with applicable but not karst specific INDOT Standard Specifications...” [“... and other BMPs identified in the Section 5 DEIS/FEIS/ROD and Draft/Final Karst Feature and Groundwater Flow Investigations Report and the 1993 Karst MOU...”]

Response:

Language has been revised as requested.



AF002-58 (Response reflects consideration of USFWS request in 3/12/2013 webcast.)

Comment:

Appendix L – Pollutant Loading Estimate Table and FHWA Methodology Annual Pollutant Load Calculations – Appendix L of the karst report displays the modeling outputs for pollutant loading, and reproduces the pages from an FHWA training course where the modeling approach was provided. Limited to no information/discussion is presented in the DEIS regarding the validity, applicability and uncertainty of the modeling that was conducted for pollutant loading analysis in Appendix L.

Recommendation: Please provide information on the validation, applicability, and uncertainty of the modeling that was conducted for the pollutant loading analysis in Appendix L. A summary of this information should also be provided in DEIS/FEIS Section 5.21.3.8 Pollutant Loading Analysis. Please address the following:

- Validation: Has this model been found to predict pollutant loads from highway runoff reasonably well? Please summarize and cite, as appropriate, the results of validation studies.
- Applicability: This model was developed before the phase-out of leaded gasoline; does this have any effect on the results predicted for a 21st century scenario?
- Uncertainty: A discussion of the uncertainty in the results should also be provided, particularly in light of the cautions in the model documentation itself (starting on page 8-22 in Appendix L: 1) *“The procedure should be limited to non-winter periods, “ 2) “Long dry periods and overlapping storms present predictive problems in determining the pre-storm surface load”* [consider in terms of recent years’ recurring droughts], and 3) *“Construction activities are difficult to simulate unless monitoring data is [sic] available to determine K1 values.”*

This additional information will provide a more solid basis for using these modeling results in impact assessment, mitigation planning, and decision-making.

Response:

The pollutant loading calculation methodology was developed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and is the standard methodology used by the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) to satisfy the Karst MOU pollutant loading requirement. The modeling procedure was developed based on a monitoring program conducted in 1976 and 1977 at sites in Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; Nashville, Tennessee; and Denver, Colorado. The model uses Total Solids as the carrier pollutant for the model because they showed the highest correlation with the other monitored quality parameters when regression analysis was performed.



The methodology in Appendix L of the Karst Report (footnote under Table 8.2.4) states that caution must be used when interpreting the pollutant loadings of lead predicted by the model because the reduction in lead in gasoline has resulted in an estimated 50% reduction in lead loadings since the predictive procedure equation was developed. A discussion of the uncertainty related to the results is included in Appendix L of the Karst Report and will be summarized in Section 5.21, *Karst Impacts*. In addition, Section 5.21 lists assumptions that were used in the analysis because final design information is not yet available.

AF002-59 Comment:

I-69 Tier 2 Section 5 DEIS Errata

EPA's review of the Section 5 DEIS found that numerous erroneous referrals to Figures and/or Tables in the DEIS for specific information. This often made review of the information in the EIS confusing and needlessly time consuming. We identify some, but not all of this figure/table referral errata and general text errata, in our comments below.

Recommendation: We recommend that FHWA/INDOT/Consultants carefully review the EIS and make sure that all the FEIS referrals to figures/tables, and text are correct/accurate.

Response:

References to figures and tables have been updated.

AF002-60 Comment:

Table of Contents

Table of Contents (continued), Volume II – Appendices, Located on DVD, page xxi]. The heading (i.e., "List of Figures") for the list of Appendices on page xxi is incorrect.

Recommendation: We recommend the FEIS re-title the heading as "List of Appendices."

Response:

This change has been made as requested.

AF002-61 Comment:

Chapter 1 – Background

Figure 1-3: Tier 2 Section 5 Study Corridor (page 1-20). The figure's legend does not provide an icon that specifically identifies the Section 5 corridor. The legend provides an icon (yellow zig zag line) that identifies a Section 1 location. The geographic extent of the figure does not include the Section 1 Corridor area.



Recommendation: We recommend the FEIS provide a corrected version of the legend for Figure 1-3.

Response:

Figure legend has been changed as requested.

AF002-62 Comment:

Chapter 3 – Alternatives

3.1.4 Traffic Modeling (page 3-4): The last sentence here incorrectly states: “The *I-69 Corridor Model* documentation, which provides the technical documentation for the Tier 2 traffic forecasting methodology, is included as Appendix DD, *MOT, Queue Analysis*.”

Recommendation: We recommend the FEIS correctly identify the “The *I-69 Corridor Model* documentation, which provides the technical documentation for the Tier 2 traffic forecasting methodology, is included as Appendix GG, *MOT, Queue Analysis*.”

Response:

Reference has been updated as requested in Section 3.1.2, *Traffic Modeling*. Note that Appendix GG is entitled “*I-69 Corridor Model Documentation*.”

AF002-63 Comment:

3.2.1 Methodology (page 3-9, Step #5): The fifth step in FHWA/INDOT’s consultant’s alternatives methodology incorrectly implies that the preferred alternative identified in this DEIS has the blessings of the environmental resource and permitting agencies.

Recommendation: Unless there is written correspondence up to the time that the DEIS was published that explicitly shows that one or more of the agencies agree with the DEIS identified preferred Alternative, then the FEIS must clarify that the DEIS identified preferred alternative is only FHWA’s and/or INDOT’s and/or FHWA/INDOT/Consultant’s preferred alternative and not the resource and/or permitting agencies’ preferred alternative.

Response:

Clarification has been provided in the FEIS and information updated based on DEIS comments.



AF002-64 Comment:

3.3 Screening of Alternatives

The information depicted in Tables 3-7 and 3-8 is not explained in the Tables and the text is confusing. For example, please clarify what is meant by: "It should be noted that VMT increases to a much greater degree than VMT" (5th sentence, page 3-60).

Recommendation: We recommend that additional information be included in the above mentioned Tables in the FEIS so that the reader can interpret the information the tables are trying to convey.

Recommendation: We recommend the FEIS reconcile the VMT and VHT shown in 3.3.1.1 Congestion, Table 3-7 and Table 3-8 with numbers provided in the text in 3.3.1.3, Transportation Performance Measures Summary, Total Congested VMT and Total congested VHT (pages.3-62 and 3-63).

Response:

Additional information and clarification has been provided as requested.

AF002-65 Comment:

Table 3-9 Build Versus No-Build Safety Comparison (page 3-62).

Recommendation: We recommend the FEIS reconcile the difference in the numbers reported in Table 3-9 and the numbers provided in the text in 3.3.1.3 Transportation Performance Measures Summary, Safety (p.3-63).

Response:

Data have updated and reconciled as requested.

AF002-66 Comment:

Chapter 4- Affected Environment

Section 4.2- Human Environment (page 4.2-28, last sentence): Do you mean State Road (SR) 37 instead of SR 27?

Recommendation: We recommend the correct roadway be identified here in the FEIS.

Response:

Corrected reference to SR 37 has been added.



AF002-67 **Comment:**

Chapter 5- Environmental Consequences

5.19 Water Quality Impacts

Page 5.19-34 of the DEIS states that Figure 5.19-2 shows the streams by type (perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral, location, and relationship to the alternatives in Section 5. However, Figure 5.19-2 Section 5 Streams (pages 5-19.106 through 5.19-119, sheets 1 to 14) makes no distinction between perennial, intermittent and ephemeral stream types.

Recommendation: We recommend that for the FEIS, either the text should be corrected or the figure/s that shows Section 5 Stream impacts should distinguish between perennial, intermittent and ephemeral stream locations in relation to the alternatives.

Response:

Figure 5.19-2 has been updated to shows stream types and it also includes the Stream ID# that associates with various tables provided throughout Section 5.19, *Water Quality Impacts*.

AF002-68 **Comment:**

5.19.2.5 Summary (page 5.19-83, third to last sentence): Table 5.19-16 does not provide a summary of potential surface water resource impacts by alternative as stated here. Table 5.19-16 Potential Open Water Impacts (page 5.19-79) provides the proposed acres of mitigation for open water impacts for each alternative. Did you mean to refer to Table 5.19-18 Summary of Potential Impacts to Surface Waters by Alternative (page 5.19-85)?

Recommendation: We recommend the FEIS identify the correct table that provides the summary of potential surface water resource impacts by alternative.

Response:

Reference has been corrected to refer to Table 5.19-18.

AF002-69 **Comment:**

5.24 Indirect Cumulative Impacts

This DEIS chapter includes numerous referrals to Figures and/or Tables elsewhere in the DEIS for specific information regarding waters wells, impaired streams, etc. that is erroneous. This makes review of the information in the EIS confusing and time consuming. We identify some, but not all of this figure/table referral errata, in our comments below.

Recommendation: We recommend that FHWA/INDOT/Consultants carefully review the EIS and make sure that all FEIS referrals to figures/tables, etc. are correct/accurate.



Response:

Tables and figure references have been corrected as requested.

AF002-70

Comment:

5.24.2 Methodology (page 5.24-2): Please note that EPA, Region 5 did not develop a document in 2000 titled "The National Environmental Policy Act- Conducting Quality Cumulative Effects Analysis" as implied here. Perhaps you are referring to materials developed by Environmental Planning Strategies, Inc., for a training session Region 5 hosted regarding NEPA Document Review under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act with an emphasis on conducting quality cumulative effects analyses on August 8-10, 2000.

Recommendation: We recommend the FEIS correct this resource listing to show that Environmental Planning Strategies, Inc. developed the training materials for the 2000 course hosted by EPA, Region 5 on August 8-10, 2012 [2000].

Response:

Reference to the August 8-10, 2000 document has been corrected as requested.

AF002-71

Comment:

Karst (page 5.24-30): Figure 5.21-2 does not show the general locations of the identified karst features relative to Section 5 corridor as stated here in the last sentence of the first paragraph under Karst. Figure 5.21-2 Solutions Features Characteristic of Karst Terrain (p. 5.21-1).

Recommendation: The error discussed above should be corrected for the FEIS.

Response:

Changed figure references to Figures 5.21-3 and 5.21-4.

AF002-72

Comment:

Streams (page 5.24-42): Figure 5.19-4 does not show the location of impaired streams as stated here in the second to the 2nd to the last sentence of the first paragraph on this page. There is no Figure 5.19-4 in the DEIS. Do you mean Figure 5.19-3 (page 5.19-120)? In addition, Table 4.3-1 (page 4.3-36) does not list impaired waterbodies in the vicinity of Section 5 as stated in the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 5.24-42.

Recommendation: We recommend the FEIS refer the reader to the correct figure and table in the FEIS that has the impaired streams information.



Response:

References updated to refer to Figure 5.19-3 and Section 4.3.2.3, *Rivers, Streams, and Watersheds. Table 4.3-1.*

AF002-73 Comment:

Karst (page.5.24-45): Table 5.21-3 is not the impacts table as stated here. It is the Best Management Practices in Karst Terrain table (p.5.24-35 to 38). Did you mean to refer the reader to Table 5.21-2: Potential Karst Features Impacts by Karst Area and Alternative, on page 5.21-22 of the DEIS?

Recommendation: We recommend the FEIS refer the reader to the correct table in the FEIS that has the karst impacts for each alternative.

Response:

Reference updated to refer to Table 5.21-2.

AF002-74 Comment:

Water well locations (page 5.24-47): The next to last paragraph, second sentence on this page directs the reader to Figure 4.3-4 in Section 4.3 Natural Environment for a figure that shows existing water well locations. DEIS Figure 4.3-4 Bedrock Geology (page 4.3-42), does not depict existing water well locations.

Recommendation: We recommend the FEIS direct the viewer to the appropriate figure that identifies the locations of water well locations.

Response:

Reference updated to Figure 4.3-7.

AF002-75 Comment:

Karst features (page 5.24-47): The first sentence of the last paragraph on this page directs the reader to Figure 5.21-2 (Section 5.21 Karst Impacts) for a depiction of the general locations of the identified karst features relative to the Section 5 corridor. Figure 5.21-2 Solution Features Characteristic of Karst Terrain (page 5.21-1) does not depict the general locations of the identified karst features relative to the Section 5 corridor. Did you mean figure 5.21-3 Location of Section 5 Karst Areas (p. 5.21-44) and/or Figure 4.3-5 Karst Features and Springs (page 4.3-44)?



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Recommendation: We recommend the FEIS direct the viewer to the appropriate figure that identifies the location of karst features relative to the Section 5 corridor.

[Enclosure 2 of 2 – Summary of Rating Definitions and Follow Up Action]

Response:

Changed figure reference to Figures 5.21-3 and 5.21-4.

AF003 **1/2/2013 E-mail (FHWA) / Letter**
Lindy Nelson, DOI, Regional Environmental Officer

AF003-01 **Comment:**

As requested, the Department of Interior (Department) has reviewed the October 2012 Tier 2 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Project, Section 5, between Bloomington and Martinsville in Monroe and Morgan Counties, Indiana (EIS#: FHWA-IN-EIS-12-01-D). With respect to those portions of the document for which the Department or its bureaus have jurisdiction or special expertise, we are providing the following comments and recommendations for your consideration.

Response:

Comment noted.

Section 4(f) Comments

AF003-02 **Comment:**

The DEIS considers effects to two identified properties in the project study area eligible to be considered under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (codified at 49 U.S.C. 303§ 771.135) associated with the Tier 2 study of Section 5 of the I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis project. Section 5 begins at State Route (SR) 37 southwest of Bloomington and continues to SR 39 in Martinsville. The study area for Section 5 includes Monroe, Owen, Greene, Brown and Morgan counties. Section 5 is approximately 21 miles in length. The Section 5 project consists of upgrading SR 37 to interstate highway standards. SR 37 is a four-lane, divided highway which has multiple, diverse access points. Most of these access points are at grade.

This evaluation, prepared by Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), considered the impacts to Wapehani Mountain Bike Park, a recreational property, and the North Clear Creek Historic Landscape District, a historic property eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Specific impacts depend upon the alternate chosen for implementation. For the Wapehani Mountain Bike Park, INDOT and FHWA propose to make a *de minimis* determination for the

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

impacts associated with two of the alternatives, though the preferred alternative avoids any use of the property. For the North Clear Creek Historic Landscape District, the INDOT and FHWA also propose a *de minimis* determination because they have made a determination of No Adverse Effect to the property by the preferred alternative. In both cases, neither the City of Bloomington, property owner/manager of the Bike Park, nor the State Historic Preservation Officer for the Historic District have concurred with the *de minimis* finding.

The Department cannot concur with the INDOT and FHWA because there is no evidence that the City of Bloomington or the State Historic Preservation Officer have agreed to the determinations. We will reserve our concurrence with the hope that the Final EIS will present the necessary agreements.

Response:

Chapter 8 reflects the impacts to Wapehani Mountain Bike Park associated with the Refined Preferred Alternative as determined through on-going consultation with the City as the agency with jurisdiction over this Section 4(f) resource. The City of Bloomington has concurred with the *de minimis* determination that the Project will not adversely affect the features, attributes, or activities qualifying the Wapehani Mountain Bike Park for protection under Section 4(f). The concurrence of the City of Bloomington and the measures to offset impacts of I-69 on this resource are outlined in the MOA between FHWA, INDOT and the City of Bloomington (see FEIS Appendix QQ, *Wapehani Memorandum of Agreement*). DEIS comments and suggestions to offset impacts pertaining to the Wapehani Mountain Bike Park were considered in this process.

In the case of the North Clear Creek Historic Landscape District, the SHPO concurred with FHWA's determination in its November 21, 2012 letter and the ACHP formally concurred in their May 9, 2013 letter. This correspondence and responses to comments related to cultural resources (above-ground and below-ground) are provided as appendices to the 800.11(e) Documentation. See Appendix N, *Section 106 Documentation*.

AF003-03 Comment:

Chapter 8 [Section 4(f)] appears to be silent on properties owned by the FWS and/or properties that may have a federal interest (e.g., Pittman-Robertson & Dingell-Johnson funds) such as state wildlife management areas. Please indicate if any such properties occur in the project area and if so, whether or not they may be affected.

Response:

Section 5.22 identifies managed lands within the corridor. Nine of the privately-owned managed land properties participate in the IDNR CFWP, while six are enrolled in the USDA-NRCS CRP. Based upon review of the purposes of these programs, Section 4(f) does not apply to these properties.



No United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) lands were identified within the project corridor. The Beanblossom Bottoms Nature Preserve, which is managed by the USFWS, is beyond the limits of the corridor. No state wildlife management areas will be impacted by the project. No properties acquired or improved with Pittman-Robertson & Dingell-Johnson funds are known to be impacted by any of the alternatives. This clarification has been added to Chapter 5.22, *Managed Lands and Natural Areas*.

AF003-04 Comment:

General Comments

In contrast to the first four sections, which were developed on new terrain, Section 5 of I-69 interstate project involves the upgrading of an existing, multi-lane divided highway, to a full freeway facility. Most of the right-of-way used for Section 5 is already devoted to transportation use. Overall, the preferred alternative for the I-69 alignment in Section 5 (Alternative 8) demonstrates a reasonable effort to avoid impacts to natural resources, including minimizing habitat fragmentation and impacts to karst features.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) is greatly in favor of the Indiana Department of Transportation's (INDOT) previous commitments to bridge the entire floodplains of various streams and rivers and encourages the continued employment of this practice within Section 5, where possible. The FWS also strongly supports the proposed development of wildlife crossings throughout the Section 5 project area. Because of the rural and densely forested nature of parts of the project area, minimizing habitat gaps and barriers to wildlife movement is very important.

Response:

Since Section 5 involves the upgrade of SR 37 to interstate standards along its existing alignment, existing structures will be reused where possible. This may require widening existing structures to provide the required lanes and shoulders.

As noted in the Section 5.18 *Wildlife Considerations*, at those stream crossings where new structures are required due to geometric or structural requirements and where there is evidence of wildlife use, the design specifications will provide for wildlife habitat connectivity, including adequate space under bridges with dry land unarmored with riprap, with minimum dimensions (8 feet tall by 24 feet wide) to allow for wildlife passage. For those structures which can be widened or rehabilitated to meet the geometric or structural requirements, the existing bridge openings will be retained and any wildlife that currently crosses under SR 37 will continue to be able to use these existing structures to cross under I-69.

The FEIS assumes that the following mainline stream crossings will be rehabilitated: Griffy Creek, Beanblossom Creek (southern crossing), Beanblossom Creek Overflow (northern crossing), Bryant Creek, and Little Indian Creek. For these cases, the existing bridge openings will be retained.

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

The Little Indian Creek structure carrying the west-side access road will be a newly constructed bridge; however, it is to be located immediately adjacent to the widened I-69 southbound bridge over Little Indian Creek. Regardless of the opening provided for the new access road, passage of wildlife will be limited as a result of the adjacent structures upstream. Therefore the access road crossing is planned to meet the same opening as exists for the I-69 southbound bridge (a 6-foot by 6-foot allowance on both ends of the structure).

The structures over Jordan Creek are planned for replacement; however the adjacent land use is open agricultural, with no forested habitat in the vicinity. The structures are sized to convey hydraulic requirements only.

AF003-05 Comment:

There are a couple of interchange options the FWS would like to address. With respect to the specific alternatives discussed for Subsection 5D, we recommend that the proposed partial Walnut Street interchange (Alternative 8, Option B) be considered in order to minimize impacts to wetlands, streams and floodplains in the Beanblossom Creek area. We understand that this configuration will require special approval from the Federal Highway Administration in order to move forward.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-46 response.

AF003-06 Comment:

In addition, the FWS recommends that the interchange design at the Liberty Church Road intersection be carefully considered due to the proposed multiple crossings of Little Indian Creek and its tributaries. This interchange is within the West Fork (White River) – Bryant Creek maternity colony area of the Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*). Records indicate that the Indiana bat does use Little Indian Creek for foraging and/or traveling; a male bat was captured very near the proposed interchange location in 2004. Little Indian Creek provides some connectivity between the West Fork White River west of existing S.R. 37 and forested areas east of the roadway. Care should be taken to adequately size bridges to allow bats to cross under the roadways and also to preserve as much of the riparian corridor along the waterways as possible in order to maintain foraging habitat and forest cover. It appears that Alternative 7 may result in fewer impacts to the streams in this area; if this is the case, this alternative (for Subsection 5F) should be explored in more detail.

Response:

Please refer to AF003-04 response above for sizing of bridges for wildlife considerations. In the Refined Preferred Alternative, the skew of the Liberty Church diamond interchange has been shifted north to lessen impacts to floodplains.



AF003-07 Comment:

WATER RESOURCE IMPACTS

Page 5.19-34 indicates that a majority of the streams in Section 5 are low to moderate quality based on scoring using the Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI) and the Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index (HHEI). While there are many ephemeral and intermittent streams with low HHEI scores, there are some that scored in the moderate to high range. Overall, 99 of the 330 intermittent and ephemeral streams had scores either over 40 (30 for modified channels) or 60, which indicates a moderate or high potential to support diversity in stream plants and animals, respectively. For perennial streams, approximately 40% of the 29 stream crossings/reaches had QHEI scores above 51, which indicates these streams are at least partially supportive of their aquatic life use designation. Impacts from the project and further degradation of already impacted streams should be minimized and avoided. This is of particular concern for Beanblossom Creek and Little Indian Creek (and their tributaries), which are crossed at several locations by the preferred alternative and are known to be used by the Indiana bat. Bridging the floodplains and minimizing in-stream work and stream relocations should be a top priority. Furthermore, due to the steep terrain and karst topography in parts of the project area, proper erosion and sediment control is vital.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-34, AF003-04, and AF003-08 responses.

AF003-08 Comment:

The FWS is generally opposed to the realignment of stream channels unless there is no other alternative and the purpose involves public safety or protection of the stream itself. Project cost should not be used to justify large alterations in stream channels unless it can be demonstrated that preserving the existing channel alignment would make the entire project cost-prohibitive. Adverse impacts resulting from channel alterations include loss of aquatic habitat, destabilization of the channel hydraulics and accelerated bank erosion and sedimentation. We recommend the following measures be included where stream relocations are necessary:

1. Limit the length of channel to be realigned to the minimum necessary for the bridge construction.
2. If the channel reach to be realigned contains good bottom substrates (i.e. gravel, cobbles and boulders), stockpile this material and use it for substrate in the new channel.
3. Minimize the use of riprap and other artificial bank protection. Use bioengineering techniques wherever possible.



4. If riprap is used, extend it below low-water to enhance aquatic habitat.
5. Construct the new channel with bank slopes and bottom elevations equivalent to those in the natural channel.
6. Use best methods to contain soil and sediment runoff during construction. Use silt curtains or other devices at the downstream end of the project to contain bottom sediment in the newly excavated channel and to prevent it from adding to the downstream sediment load. Maintain such devices by removal of accumulated sediment.
7. Plant native hardwood trees and shrubs in a zone at least 50 feet wide on both sides of the new channel.

Response:

These suggestions will be considered as potential best management practices. Where there is an opportunity to reduce the stream relocations, this will be considered in evaluating impacts to all resources. It should be noted that since this project entails an upgrade of an existing multi-lane divided arterial, that streams crossing it already are impacted. Stream impacts within existing SR 37 right-of-way are shown relative to new stream lengths impacted in FEIS Table 5.19-18.

AF003-09 (Response reflects consideration of USFWS request in 3/12/2013 webcast.)**Comment:**

Finally, the application of the methods presented in the publication “Measuring the Impact of Development on Maine Surface Waters (Morse, Chandler and S. Kahl. 2003) (Page 5.24-42) may not be applicable in areas of karst topography such as are present in portions of Section 5 of the I-69 project.

Response:

The use of analysis methods in the publication titled “Measuring the Impact of Development on Maine Surface Waters” is consistent with indirect impact analyses completed for other I-69 sections. Following resource agency review and comments on the I-69 Section 2 Tier 2 DEIS, additional analysis of potential indirect impacts to streams was conducted. In particular, the USFWS requested more information regarding indirect water quality impacts to streams resulting from induced development associated with the Section 2 project. Based on this comment, additional evaluation was conducted regarding indirect or induced development from I-69 and its associated effect on stream and water quality. From this additional evaluation, it was determined that it is more accurate to state, “while there will inevitably be some indirect impact to streams, any such indirect impact will be insignificant.” That such indirect impacts will be insignificant is supported by the document cited by USFWS in its Section 2 Tier 2 DEIS



comment. The USFWS referenced the publication cited above, “Measuring the Impact of Development on Maine Surface Waters” (Morse, Chandler and S. Kahl, 2003). This publication discusses the threshold of land disturbance above which ecological damage to surface waters occurs. The publication states (pages 2-4):

“[t]he percentage of the total impervious area (PTIA), or the amount of the watershed covered by surfaces preventing water infiltration, has been found to be predictive of the amount of stress and degradation to the stream (p. 4). Studies from many places in the US have identified a threshold for development at about 10% (PTIA) of the watershed area, above which surface waters become degraded (p. 2). Watershed imperviousness (caused by pavement, gravel, roads, sidewalks, driveways and roofs which prevent water from soaking into the soil) was found to be a good predictor of the level of degradation of the overall stream condition” (p. 2).

In addition, the Center of Watershed Protection (CWP) developed the Impervious Cover Model (ICM) as discussed in the “Impacts of Impervious Cover on Aquatic Systems” (March 2003).³ The ICM agrees with the study completed in Maine that when a watershed reaches 10% impervious surface most stream water qualities decline. While the CWP identifies that this model applies to mid-Atlantic, northeast, southeast, upper Midwest, and Pacific Northwest portions of the US where the model has been tested, they also state that limited testing in the lower Midwest agrees with the ICM. The CWP also states that more watershed research is needed in karst regions.

While the publication studied the PTIA thresholds in Maine and the impervious threshold of degradation can be somewhat variable across the nation, the ICM agreed with the study completed in Maine for the upper Midwest and limited testing shows agreement in the lower Midwest. The CWP acknowledged that additional research is needed in karst regions. Because a portion of Section 5 is within a karst region, research was conducted to determine if karst-specific data was available. No data was found specific to karst regions. Therefore, an analysis of the PTIA (using the methodology used in the publication) was completed within the entire Section 5 Study Area for the watersheds that were impacted by Section 5 directly or indirectly. Further information regarding indirect impact analysis conducted for the 14-digit watersheds crossed by Section 5 can be found in Section 5.24.3, *Analysis (9. Determine the magnitude and significance of cumulative effects by identifying the changes in Section 5 as a result of I-69)*.

³ Center for Watershed Protection. “Impacts of Impervious Cover on Aquatic Systems.” *Watershed Protection Research Monograph No. 1*. Pp 1, 3, 12. 2003. <http://www.cwp.org/store/free-downloads.html>. (Last accessed April 7, 2013).

**AF003-10 Comment:****ENDANGERED SPECIES COMMENTS**

The FWS's concerns regarding I-69's impacts to the federally endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and the formerly listed bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) have been addressed in a Revised Tier 1 Biological Opinion (BO) for this project, dated August 26, 2006 (amended May 25, 2011). Section 5-specific impacts to these two species will be detailed in a Tier 2 Biological Assessment (BA) being prepared by FHWA and INDOT, which the FWS's Bloomington, Indiana Field Office will review prior to completion of the Section 5 Final EIS. If impacts detailed in the Tier 2 BA are consistent with those analyzed in the Revised Tier 1 BO, the FWS will issue a separate Tier 2 Biological Opinion and Incidental Take Statement for Section 5 of the I-69 project and thereby complete consultation as required by Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (as amended).

Response:

The Section 5 Tier 2 BA was submitted to the USFWS Bloomington, Indiana Field Office on December 19, 2012. The USFWS issued a Tier 2 BO for Section 5 on July 25, 2013. Consultation as required by Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (as amended) is considered complete.

AF003-11 Comment:

The DEIS does not discuss or mention the recent discovery of two new maternity colonies within the Section 5 project corridor. This past summer (2012), during project-related Indiana bat surveys, INDOT's consultants documented a new colony of Indiana bats, just north of the original colony. In addition, during an unrelated survey, a separate colony was discovered along Beanblossom Creek, north of Bloomington. This brings the total to three documented Indiana bat maternity colonies within the Section 5 corridor, for a total of 16 colonies project-wide. More in-depth information on these new colonies will be detailed in the Tier 2 BA and subsequent BO; however, the DEIS should document the recent discoveries of these two new colonies and update any text that references the presence of only one colony in Section 5. Furthermore, there are eight (8) documented Indiana bat hibernacula within five miles of the project right-of-way. No Critical Habitat is present within the Section 5 project area.

Response:

The Section 5 Tier 2 BA (FEIS Appendix LL1) discusses the two additional Indiana bat maternity colonies in detail. The resulting Section 5 Tier 2 BO also addresses the two additional Indiana bat maternity colonies. The Section 5 Tier 2 BO was issued on July 25, 2013 and is included in Appendix LL2. In addition, Tier 1 Section 7 Consultation was reinitiated with USFWS to address the discovery of the two additional maternity colonies as well as other items related to the Indiana bat. The resulting revised Tier 1 BO Amendment 2 was issued on July 24, 2013 and is included in Appendix BB. A discussion of these two maternity colonies and the updated total of 16 colonies project-



wide is included in the FEIS, Section 5.17, *Bald Eagles, Federal and State Threatened and Endangered Species*.

AF003-12 **Comment:**

Although the bald eagle was removed from the list of threatened and endangered species in July, 2007, it is still protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (Eagle Act). On May 20, 2008 the FWS issued regulations that created a new permit category to provide Eagle Act permits to entities previously authorized to take bald eagles through Section 7 Incidental Take Statements. The FHWA and INDOT have indicated they will comply with the all permit requirements previously established for the bald eagle for this project through Section 7 consultation. The FWS is aware of one eagle nest in the vicinity of the project corridor, approximately 0.3 miles from the Section 5 Preferred Alternative and 0.5 miles from existing SR 37. The proposed construction activities are beyond the recommend 660 foot buffer as described in the FWS's National Bald Eagle Management Guidelines. The parcel containing the eagle nest is proposed to be permanently protected via a conservation easement as part of the project's mitigation activities.

Response:

FHWA and INDOT will comply with all permit requirements previously established for the bald eagle for this project through Section 7 consultation. The bald eagle nest referenced is discussed in Section 5.17.3.2. The nest is located on a parcel being pursued for I-69 Section 5 forest mitigation. Once environmental clearance for this mitigation site is complete, a conservation easement will be pursued.

AF003-13 **Comment:**

Lastly, the FWS recommends that a vehicle for funding the long term management (i.e. invasive species control, levee/berm repair, etc.) of mitigation sites be established. This will help ensure the continued viability of these sites for the Indiana bat and other species, beyond the initial five to ten year monitoring period.

Response:

INDOT will be responsible for monitoring and maintenance of these mitigation sites for the 10-year monitoring period. After the 10-year monitoring period, there is currently no requirement or funding mechanism proposed for any long-term management of these mitigation sites. As such, INDOT will be the long-term manager of these sites unless the site(s) is granted to a third party agency or organization for long-term management. If the site(s) is granted to a third party for long-term management, the agreement between INDOT and the third party will state the terms and conditions of the long-term management responsibilities of the site(s).



AF003-14 **Comment:**

KARST

Page 5.21-25: The discussion of buried sinks and sinkhole concerns for the SR45/2nd Street exit should include whether or not adding the split interchange for Tapp Road verses an overpass at Tapp Road increases the potential problem of roadbed failure and/or reopened sinkholes since the exits are so close to one another.

Response:

The text in Section 5.21, *Karst Impacts*, has been revised to reflect the increased potential for roadbed subsidence and/or reopened sinkhole(s) with the addition of the additional lanes related to the split interchange selection versus reuse of the existing 2nd Street interchange and Tapp Road overpass. By identifying this area as an area of concern during the NEPA studies, the questioned increased potential for roadbed subsidence and/or reopened sinkhole(s) will be included as part of subsequent geotechnical, final design, construction, mitigation, and operations phases of the project. These phases will continue to be performed in accordance with the previously cited Karst MOU and in consultation with the Karst MOU signatory agencies.

AF003-15 **Comment:**

Page 5.21-29: In the discussion of potential increased impacts to the Cave A and B recharge areas there is no mention of the new Fullerton Pike Interchange (only the addition of a travel lane and wider shoulder, etc.). Will the new interchange impact these recharge areas and if so, how? Could the new interchange be of “sufficient magnitude” to adversely affect the identified species in either Cave A or Cave B?

Response:

The text in Section 5.21, *Karst Impacts*, has been revised to reflect that the portions of the on/off ramps in the southeast quadrant of the Fullerton Pike interchange are also within the Cave A recharge area. Since most of the Fullerton Pike interchange is located outside of the Cave A recharge area, the Fullerton Pike interchange is not considered to be of sufficient magnitude to adversely affect the Cave A fauna. By identifying the Cave A recharge area as an area of concern during the NEPA studies, subsequent geotechnical, final design, construction, mitigation, and operations phases of the project will continue to address the Cave A recharge area in accordance with the previously cited Karst MOU and in consultation with the Karst MOU signatory agencies.

Cave B recharge area is located over 800 feet south of the Section 5 corridor, the approximate recharge area for Cave B has been added to both Section 5.21, *Karst Impacts*, and to Appendix Y, *Final Karst Report (Redacted)*.



AF003-16 Comment:

Page 5.21-30: The DEIS cites study results from a highway project on SR 37 (Lawrence County) in the early 90's. These results indicated that construction-related activities elevated pollutant loadings to the subsurface during construction and that these levels returned to pre-construction levels two years after construction. INDOT anticipates a similar pattern of pollutant loadings for Section 5 of the I-69 project. Please address whether or not it is possible (20 years later and with better technology and methods), to substantially decrease the pollutant loading during construction in these sensitive karst environments and strive to return to pre-construction conditions in a time frame shorter than two years.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-42 response.

AF003-17 Comment:

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Page S-57: The DEIS indicates that the Fullerton Pike corridor improvements have not been calculated or included in the cumulative totals (the project is in the early environmental planning stages). At a minimum, some discussion should be included within Section 5.24, Cumulative Impacts, to acknowledge the likely karst impacts from the Fullerton Pike corridor improvement project. Based on the footprint of the project alone, there will be impacts to the relevant karst area near the I-69 corridor where the proposed road improvements are expected to tie into the I-69 project.

Response:

On February 4, 2013, the I-69 Project Team met with Monroe County to further coordinate the I-69 and Fullerton Pike projects. Section 5.24, *Indirect and Cumulative Impacts*, includes additional qualitative discussion regarding the ongoing Fullerton Pike Project.

AF003-18 Comment:

Page S63, 2nd paragraph: Please clarify whether Indiana bats were reported in Salamander Cave in 2009 or 2010. The information the FWS has indicates they were most recently reported in 2010.

Response:

Clarified statement to read: "A third hibernaculum within the WAA was also purchased, and it had approximately 50-60 wintering Indiana bats in 2010."



AF003-19 Comment:

Page S68: Please add karst training requirements, such as karst-specific field check meetings and awareness video, to the list of mitigation measures.

Response:

Information has been added as requested.

AF003-20 Comment:

Page 3-54: The table indicates that the alternatives pass through only one Indiana bat maternity colony. This should be updated to include the Beanblossom Creek and Lamb's Creek colonies.

Response:

Table 3-5 has been updated to include the Beanblossom Bottoms Nature Preserve and Lambs Creek Indiana bat colonies.

AF003-21 Comment:

Page 3-81: Same issue as above.

Response:

Table 3-16 has been updated to include the Beanblossom Bottoms Nature Preserve and Lambs Creek Indiana bat colonies.

AF003-22 Comment:

Pages 5.2-18-20: This section discusses the availability of land for the displaced institutions and businesses. Where is the available land and is it forested? What type of impacts may occur if this land is developed?

Response:

Information about when and where affected property owners would relocate is not available at this stage of the project. I-69 Section 5 displacements will be finalized during the project's final design phase. Potential availability of replacement housing and commercial and institutional property was evaluated during Summer 2012 using market conditions based on existing structures from that time period. Projections were made that similar property types (as identified in Summer 2012) would be available at the time future relocations occur. Based on business needs survey feedback, the project team also anticipates that many relocations would occur on sites with previously



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

developed/existing facilities. Most businesses and institutions, in particular, would be expected to relocate to existing facilities.

In terms of forest impacts, Section 5.24, *Indirect and Cumulative Impacts*, documents potential I-69 Section 5 direct and indirect effects added to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions of others. Forests are one of the resources evaluated from a cumulative standpoint. Through coordination with an Expert Land Use Panel, anticipated impacts from employment and housing growth and development were evaluated and quantified. Furthermore, anticipated forest impact descriptions are described in detail in Section 5.20, *Forest Impacts*.

AF003-23 Comment:

Page 5.3-81: The DEIS does not have the first 4 figures that are referenced on this page.

Response:

It is assumed that these figures were inadvertently omitted from the hard copy received by reviewer. These figures were also provided in PDF format on the DVD of the DEIS, which was enclosed with the hard copy (see DEIS Volume I).

AF003-24 Comment:

Page 5.17-7: Footnote 5 indicates only 14 Indiana bat maternity colonies are present within the summer action area of the I-69 project. Need to include the Lamb's Creek and Beanblossom Creek colonies.

Response:

This footnote in Section 5.17.1.1, *Federally Listed Threatened and Endangered Species*, has been updated to include the Beanblossom Bottoms Nature Preserve and Lambs Creek Indiana bat colonies.

AF003-25 Comment:

Page 5.17-7: The last sentence introduces the WAA (winter action area) impacts with no previous description or mention of what or where the WAA is.

Response:

Section 5.17.1.1, *Federally Listed Threatened and Endangered Species*, has been updated to define the Winter Action Area (WAA) in the paragraph prior to discussion of impacts. The WAA is the total area that falls within a five-mile radius centered around the known Indiana bat hibernacula (caves) that have entrances located within 5 miles of the proposed I-69 Tier 1 3C corridor. The WAA includes 5-mile radius circles for 15 Indiana bat hibernacula. The WAA includes portions of Sections 4 and 5 of I-69.



AF003-26 Comment:

Page 5.17-19: Lamb’s Creek and Beanblossom Creek maternity colonies left out of DEIS discussion.

Response:

The Beanblossom Bottoms Nature Preserve and Lambs Creek Indiana bat maternity colonies have been added to this discussion in Section 5.17.3.2, *Federally-Listed Species*.

AF003-27 Comment:

Page 5.17-25: Footnote 9. It is unclear if Cave B’s recharge area is within the Sec. 5 corridor (further comments on page 5.17-42 under Herbicide Use Plan suggest it is). If so, please add map of Cave B’s recharge area. Even if Cave B’s recharge area is not directly in the corridor, it may be useful to have a map of the area since it is referenced repeatedly in the DEIS.

Response:

While Cave B is located in Section 4 and over 800 feet south of the Section 5 corridor, the approximate recharge area for Cave B has been added to Section 5.21, *Karst Impacts*, to Appendix Y, *Final Karst Report (Redacted)*, and text added to the footnotes for further clarification.

It should be noted that Cave B is better described as a karst window (a sinkhole that provided limited access to a submerged karst conduit) than a cave (a naturally occurring void in earth materials that can be entered by a human for an appreciable distance). The Low salt/No spray zone for Section 5 will extend from the Section 4 interchange to approximately 200 feet north of Chambers Pike. Cave B’s recharge area is within the proposed Low salt/No spray zone. This area has been added to Section 7.3, *Mitigation Measures and Commitments*, and to the Appendix Y, *Final Karst Report (Redacted)*.

AF003-28 Comment:

Page 5.17-39: Item number 9 indicates that the bridge with known Indiana bat use near Section 3 is being monitored by the USFWS. The bridge had been monitored by INDOT’s consultants, Bernardin, Lochmueller and Associates for several years. The USFWS is not formally conducting any monitoring of the bridge at this time. The bridge is slated to be replaced in the next few years and is undergoing separate Section 7 consultation.

Response:

Thank you for the clarification. Text updated to reflect this information.



AF003-29 Comment:

Page 5.17-42: The Herbicide Use Plan should be implemented within any area of the Section 5 right-of-way known to contain karst features.

Response:

The Low salt/No spray zone for Section 5 will extend from the Section 4 interchange to approximately 200 feet north of Chambers Pike. This includes all karst areas within Section 5 (see Section 7.3.16, *Threatened and Endangered Species*). This information has also been added to Table 7-3.

AF003-30 Comment:

Pages 5.18-16-17: Any new crossings of Beanblossom and Little Indian Creeks (such as new access roads, exit ramps, etc.) should be addressed with respect to wildlife crossings.

Response:

Please refer to AF003-04 response.

AF003-31 Comment:

Page 5.19-35: Fourth (4th) paragraph states that QHEI scores over 64 "...indicate a stream is partially supportive..." This should be changed to "capable of supporting a balanced warm water community".

Response:

Clarification has been added as requested.

AF003-32 Comment:

Pages 5.19-81-82: Drainage Control and Hazardous Spill Response: What type of roadway design elements are being incorporated to reduce the risk of hazardous materials and pollutants entering streams, particularly those streams within the Indiana bat maternity colony areas?

Response:

Please refer to AF002-32 response.



AF003-33 Comment:

Page 5.19-88: Please expand upon what role the USEPA has played in the karst study and assessment for Sections 4 and 5.

Response:

Information has been added as requested.

AF003-34 Comment:

Page 5.20-5: Do forest impacts include the relocation of existing utilities and billboards?

Response:

Forest impacts in Section 5.20 do not reflect the relocation of existing utilities and billboards, since the location of such impacts cannot be identified at this time. Estimates of the forest impact due to utility and billboard relocations are provided in the Section 5 Tier 2 Biological Assessment (BA), which is in Appendix LL1 of the FEIS.

AF003-35 Comment:

Table 5.24-3: For Alternatives 5, 7, and 8, why is no induced growth shown to occur within the TAZs that include the Monroe Hospital complex (5301504, 5301511, and 5303311)? Page 5.21-26 indicates new development is likely in this area and Alternative 4 shows induced growth in these areas.

Response:

These forecasts of induced population and employment growth were determined by a committee of local land use and development experts, as documented in DEIS Appendix E, *Expert Land Use Panel Meeting Notes*. Participants included members of the Bloomington MPO, the Monroe County Planning Commission, the Monroe County Planning Department, Indiana University, the Bloomington Plan Commission, the City of Bloomington Planning Department, and the Bloomington Economic Development Corporation.

The notes for the February 2, 2012 meeting (contained in Appendix E), documents that the committee determined that whether access to I-69 is provided at Tapp Road has a major effect upon development in the area. Tapp Road is located about one mile to the North of Fullerton Pike, which the interchange serving the Monroe County Hospital Complex is located. The following is quoted from this meeting summary:

“2. Tapp Road – Some alternatives provide for only a grade separation at Tapp Road, others include a split diamond interchange with SR 45/2nd Street. The City supports the split diamond interchange. Future



growth allocations will change substantially if access is not provided at Tapp Road. It is anticipated that 50% of employment growth will shift north and south; primarily to the North Park development, plus some south near the hospital. Household growth will increase by approximately 360 households. Household growth would come from North Park.”

The committee determined that alternatives which do not provide access to I-69 at Tapp Rd. would have growth shift elsewhere, including areas near Monroe County Hospital. Alternatives 4 and 6 do not provide for an interchange at Tapp Road; accordingly, these show growth in the vicinity of Monroe County Hospital which is not anticipated under other alternatives. Alternatives 5, 7 and 8 have an interchange at Tapp Road; accordingly, these do not show induced growth in the TAZs cited.

AF003-36 Comment:

The Indiana Department of Natural Resources recommends short light poles with shielded/direct light. While we agree that non-diffuse, direct lighting is preferred, we recommend that light poles be at least 40 feet high to prevent bats that may forage around the lights from being struck by vehicles.

Response:

The Lighting Impacts section of the Tier 2 Section 5 BA (Appendix LL1 of the FEIS), states “Any lights installed will be approximately 40 feet above the highway and would be non-diffuse.”

AF003-37 Comment:

Permits under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act will be needed for the proposed project. Our recommendations to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for permit conditions would be consistent with our comments here.

Response:

Comment noted.

AF003-38 Comment:

The Department has a continuing interest in working with the FHWA and INDOT to ensure that project impacts to resources of concern to the Department are adequately addressed. For matters related to fish and wildlife resources and federally listed threatened and endangered species, please continue to coordinate with Scott Pruitt, Field Supervisor, or Robin McWilliams Munson, project biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 620 South Walker Street, Bloomington, Indiana 47403-2121, telephone: (812) 334-4261. For continued consultation and coordination with the issues concerning the

I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement



Section 4(f) resources, please contact Regional Environmental Coordinator, Nick Chevance, Midwest Regional Office, National Park Service, 601 Riverfront Drive, Omaha, Nebraska 68102; telephone 402-661-1844.

Response:

Agency coordination will continue. Contact information noted.



State Agency Comments

AS001 **11/27/2012 E-mail-BLA**
James Sullivan, IDEM¹

AS001-01 **Comment:**

Below are our comments upon the Tier 2 Studies/Draft Karst Feature and GW Flow Investigation Report...Section 5, SR 37 south of Bloomington to SR 39. The comments are provided by Scott Johanson, Science Services Branch, Office of land Quality. If you have any questions we both will be attending the field day tomorrow.... Thanks, Jim

Response:

Comment noted. Responses to specific comments follow.

AS001-02 **Comment:**

The plan calls for the widening of the current SR 37 to three lanes in both directions and widen the shoulders. This will increase the volume of run-off that needs to be handled. Additional run-off should not be allowed in the following areas (if possible the amount of run-off should be reduced)

- 1) Along the east side of current SR-37 between the railroad over pass and the proposed location of the new 17th street / Vernal Pike bridge.

- 2) Along the west side of current SR-37 between the south side of SR-46 interchange and Hunter Valley Road.

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to AF002-04 response.

AS001-03 **Comment:**

The proposed drainage changes to the upper portion of the Illinois Central Spring drainage basin are acceptable and should not increase flow to the spring.

Response:

Comment noted.

¹ As part of ongoing coordination, draft responses to its comments were furnished to resource federal and state agencies who commented on the DEIS and a webcast was held on March 12, 2013 with resource agencies to review draft responses to comments. On March 19, 2013, IDEM provided additional clarification regarding some of its comments in an e-mail from James Sullivan. This correspondence can be found in Appendix C, *Agency Coordination Correspondence*. Where appropriate, references are made in responses to specific comments to indicate that the response reflects this follow up correspondence.



AS001-04 (Response reflects consideration of IDEM 3/19/13 follow-up comments.)

Comment:

Preliminary drawings of the area to the north of the SR-46 interchange show that a hydraulic diversion structure will be constructed to divert flow to the south (into Stouts Creek upstream of Bennett’s Dump) and to the north (into abandon quarries to the north east of Bennett’s Dump). In both cases the figure shows the diversion discharging to abandon quarries. These quarries are in close proximity to the passive drain system installed at Bennett’s Dump. Run-off should not be discharged into the abandon quarries unless it can be shown that the quarries are not connected to the passive drain system. Dye tracing will be needed to prove this.

Response:

The hydraulic diversion shown on the figure was intended to show that additional drainage will not be directed towards Bennett’s Dump. Mitigation commitments to control I-69 roadway drainage near the Bennett’s Dump to not exceed existing SR 37 roadway drainage have been added to Section 7.3, *Section 5 Mitigation Measures and Commitments*. These commitments will be noted in the final engineer’s report and design plans for Section 5. Coordination will be ongoing during the final design process with USEPA and IDEM regarding drainage flows at this superfund site. Design plans for construction in this area will be developed and provided to USEPA and IDEM for review during final design. These plans will show the proposed highway drainage. INDOT will request a two week turnaround time for comment.

In regards to additional points outlined in followup comments pertaining to blasting, erosion control, and water budgets, the following information is offered.

- 1) Blasting in this vicinity is not anticipated and will not be allowed adjacent to existing on-site wells to prevent damage to the monitoring system.
- 2) Erosion controls will be implemented throughout the construction limits. Compliance with these controls will be monitored as provided in mitigation commitments and Section 5 plans and contracts; similar to practices in Section 4 construction to the south. The project will follow Chapter 37 of the INDOT Design Manual and/or the IDEM Storm Water Quality Manual whichever is more stringent for each situation. The Contractor is required to develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for each individual project and the SWPPP must be reviewed by INDOT Environmental Services and IDEM Wetlands and Storm Water Section for comments. In addition, INDOT has a full time erosion and sediment control specialist dedicated to the project to help oversee that erosion and sediment control measures are being installed and measures are being modified based on field conditions to appropriately control erosion and sediment on the project site. Also, additional INDOT staff and other consultants have been identified to be in the field to complete contractor



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

compliance inspections on a regular basis to help control erosion and sediment on the project.

- 3) Water budgets are not part of the EIS or preliminary engineering phases of the Section 5 project but may be applicable during final design. Design plans for construction in this area will be provided to USEPA and IDEM for review as discussed in AF002-04 response.

AS001-05 Comment:

Figure 5 of 16 in Appendix N of Appendix Y does not identify Bennett's dump. Conservative buffers are needed for this site. If plans call for discharging run-off to the quarry features between SR-46 and Hunter Valley Road, these features will need to be dye traced to show additional run-off will not affect the remedial measures at Bennett's dump.

Response:

Please refer to AS001-04 response.

**AS002 12/21/2012 I-69 Website Contact Form Submission
Jim Allen, Department of Natural Resources**

AS002-01 Comment:

My name is Jim Allen and I am the Property Manager for Yellowwood and Morgan-Monroe State Forest. I have reviewed the information found in Alternative 8 for Section 5. I am in favor of this alternative as it is laid out as long as the following items are included in finale design;

- If Sample Road interchange is built, keep the access road that connects with Chambers Pike Road so our visitors will continue to have easy access from the south
- Keep the overpass at Chambers pike to give us good access to our property on the west side of 37
- If Liberty Church interchange is built, keep the access road that connects with Old 37 to allow our visitors easy access from the north
- Install signage at each of the above interchanges to direct people to our property
- At Chambers Pike, keep the access road that connects with Burma Road to provide good access to our property



Response:

Comment noted. Requested items are included in the Refined Preferred Alternative and commitments detailed in Section 7.3.15, *Managed Lands*.

AS003

1/2/2013 Letter

Matthew Buffington, DNR-Environmental Supervisor, Division of Fish and Wildlife

Also submitted by Christie L. Stanifer via project web site.

AS003-01

Comment:

1/2/2013 Submitted by e-mail Christie L. Stanifer
Environmental Coordinator
Indiana Department of Natural Resources
Division of Fish and Wildlife

The Indiana Department of Natural Resources has reviewed the above referenced project per your request. Our agency offers the following comments for your information and in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

Response:

Comment noted. Responses to specific comments follow.

AS003-02

Comment:

The Division of Fish and Wildlife recommends the alternative or combination of alternatives that results in the fewest overall impacts to fish, wildlife, and botanical resources. Alternative 8B appears to have fewer impacts than alternative 8A.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative 8B incorporates the partial Walnut Interchange which is included in the Refined Preferred Alternative. Please refer to AF002-46 response regarding the Walnut Street Interchange.

AS003-03

Comment:

Alternatives that include a shift of the roadway will have significantly higher impacts than those that do not have a shift of the alignment. Shifting of the roadway is not recommended where it will result in impacts to fish, wildlife and botanical resources beyond the current highway right-of-way. In those situations, the previously recommended alternative 6 or 7 remains the recommended alternative. We offer the following recommendations for the below interchanges, road locations, or general areas:



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Fullerton Pike: Alternatives that avoid impacts to karst springs and streams are recommended.

Response:

Preference to minimize impacts to fish, wildlife and botanical resources are noted; specific responses follow.

In regards to Fullerton Pike, a comparison of impacts between the alternatives of interest show no significant difference for these resources at this location (see Section S.7.1 *Subsection 5A*, Table S-3). Alternative 6, the DEIS Preferred Alternative 8 and the FEIS Refined Preferred Alternative have the smallest impacts to karst features when compared to Alternatives 4, 5 and 7 in the Fullerton Pike vicinity.

AS003-04

Comment:

Tapp Road: Alternatives 4 and 6 are recommended due to the lower impacts of these alternatives.

Response:

Preference noted. As summarized in Section S.7.2, *Subsection 5B*, the proposed split-diamond interchange at Tapp Road and SR 45/2nd Street allows an additional access point. This reduces traffic volumes on historically congested SR 45/2nd Street. Total cross-traffic at SR 45/2nd Street under Alternatives 4 and 6 is greater than for other alternatives – see Table 3-13.

A Tapp Road interchange also supports recent infrastructure investments by the City of Bloomington, including upgrades on Tapp Road east of SR 37 and long-range plans for planned improvements in southern Bloomington (West Airport Road, West Tapp Road, West Country Club Drive/East Winslow Road/East Rogers Road).

Alternatives 4 and 6 would not provide direct access from the interstate to the Tapp Road area (currently, Tapp Road has a signalized intersection with SR 37). In addition, providing an overpass at Tapp Road instead of an interchange would not support the City of Bloomington and Monroe County's plans.

AS003-05

Comment:

2nd St or 3rd St: There is no preference for either of the alternatives as the area is significantly urbanized, as long as any parallel controlled access roads are developed with minimal footprints.

Response:



Comment noted. The Refined Preferred Alternative does not include any parallel local access roads in the 2nd or 3rd Street areas.

AS003-06 **Comment:**

Maple Grove Road Rural Historic District: The west side of the existing road is heavily forested and contains numerous karst springs while the east side of SR37 consists of farm fields/pastures with some fencerow-type woody vegetation. Therefore, we recommend the shift to the east.

Response:

No additional right-of-way is proposed on the west side of I-69 in the area adjacent to Maple Grove Road Rural Historic District. In the Refined Preferred Alternative, there is no benefit to shifting the alignment to the east. There are no impacts to the forested areas or the karst springs on the west side as all of the proposed work will be constructed within the existing right-of-way. Alternatives 4 and 5 provide a mainline alignment shift to the east; but other alternatives remain on the existing SR 37 alignment to minimize costs and overall resource impacts. See FEIS Table 3-11 for further information.

AS003-07 **Comment:**

Walnut Street: Alternative 8B, which maintains the existing partial interchange, is recommended as it results in the lowest amounts of impacts to forested wetland and floodplain resources of all the alternatives.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-46 response.

AS003-08 **Comment:**

Walnut Street to Sample Road: Alternatives 8A/8B shift to the west and will result in greater impacts than an alternative that follows the centerline of the road with reduced-width medians that would allow frontage roads to have minimal additional impacts. In order to minimize the footprint of the road and avoid substantial impacts to forests, wetlands, streams, and karst features of the mainline plus frontage roads along this stretch, we recommend adopting the urban typical road layout where the roadway expands towards the median rather than out from the median. It does not appear that the impacts to natural resources from the wider footprint would be offset to a meaningful degree by landscaping in the dividers between the frontage roads and highway lanes and by the grassy/landscaped median between highway lanes.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Response:

Under the Refined Preferred Alternative, the east access road between the Walnut Street interchange and Hoosier Energy (shown as part of Alternative 8 in the DEIS) is removed because of low traffic volumes and to avoid impacts to natural resources associated with this access road. Hoosier Energy will have access to I-69 at the Sample Road interchange. This change lessens impacts to natural resources.

The shift to the west in this area continues to use the existing NB SR 37 pavement as the local east side access road north of Hoosier Energy; the existing SR 37 lanes will become I-69 northbound lanes. This shift makes best use of existing infrastructure and provides better access to multiple users on the east side of existing SR 37. See Table S-1 for further comparison of features of alternatives in this area.

AS003-09 Comment:

East/West connection between Sample Road and Liberty Church Road: Alternative 8 (overpass at Chambers Pike Rd) is acceptable.

Response:

Comment noted.

AS003-10 Comment:

Paragon/Pine and Liberty Church Road: Alternative 8 (overpass at Chambers Pike Rd) is acceptable to minimize impacts to forested habitat.

Response:

Comment noted.

AS003-11 Comment:

Avoidance of impacts to karst features is critical. As indicated in previous correspondence, the Karst Memorandum of Understanding should be followed, especially the strategies for minimizing the effects of highway construction and operation on karst resources. Ensure pre-construction drainage connections to caves and recharge areas are maintained during and post construction. Do not allow construction activities to fill the entrance of caves through sedimentation or impervious cover.

Response:

Comment noted. Language is included in regards to potential mitigation measures in Section 7.3.17, *Karst*, of the FEIS. Under Step 8 of the Karst MOU (discussed in Section

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

5.21.2, *Methodology*), a monitoring and maintenance plan will be developed for affected karst features. The specific mitigation design options will be coordinated during the final design process with the Karst MOU signatory agencies. Mitigation commitments to perform highway construction and operation in accordance with the Karst MOU will also be included in the final engineer’s report, and design plans for Section 5.

AS003-12 Comment:

Alternative 8B would be environmentally acceptable contingent upon mitigation measures that include a vast majority of the forested habitat mitigation consisting of the creation of high-quality habitat rather than preservation of existing habitat. The development of forested habitat mitigation areas should focus on forested areas with as low an edge-to-interior ratio as possible, with very good habitat connectivity beyond the site boundaries. The mitigation areas should also create large forested blocks or enlarge existing large forested areas, which is particularly important for mitigation sites close to or adjacent to the new road as they will form more of a barrier for wildlife movement. The use of wildlife underpasses or overpasses is recommended in the highly forested section of the road from about Chambers Pike to the crossing of Old SR 37.

Our agency appreciates this opportunity to be of service. Please do not hesitate to contact Christie Stanifer, Environmental Coordinator, at (317) 232-8163 or cstanifer@dm.in.gov if we can be of further assistance.

Response:

This comment requests that most forest mitigation acreage consist of reforestation rather than preservation. Overall levels of forest mitigation were established in the I-69 Tier 1 FEIS; see Tier 1 FEIS, Section 7.2, *Major Initiatives*, within Chapter 7, *Mitigation and Commitments*. Under “Forest Mitigation” (p. 7-5), it states, “FHWA and INDOT will voluntarily mitigate impacts to upland forest at a 3:1 ratio. This mitigation will be accomplished either by purchase of existing tracts or planting trees.” During Tier 2 studies, in consultation with resource agencies, this commitment has been further defined to provide forest replacement at a 1:1 ratio and forest preservation at a 2:1 ratio. See Section 1 Tier 2 FEIS, p. 7-10; these ratios of replacement and preservation commitments have been restated and continued in subsequent NEPA studies for I-69 Sections 2, 3 and 4 (see Section 7.2 under “Forest Mitigation” in the FEIS for each Tier 2 section). These ratios are maintained in the Section 5 EIS; see Section 7.2, *Major Mitigation Initiatives*, under “Forest Mitigation” in this FEIS.

Reforestation efforts in Section 5 are focusing on biologically attractive areas (such as forested areas in which the presence of the Indiana bat has been identified). Reforestation seeks to add to or connect existing forested areas which are biologically attractive. This has been a point of emphasis in ongoing coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding Section 5 mitigation.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Both reforestation and preservation ensure that forested areas will remain in perpetuity. These efforts not only safeguard habitat, but also protect groundwater and karst features.

AS004 **1/2/2013 E-mail (INDOT)/Letter**
Letter by Ron McAhron, Deputy Director, Indiana Department of Natural Resources
Sent in an Email by Susan Judy, DNR Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology

AS004-01 **Comment:**

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. § 4321, et seq.) and pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 4701), and implementing regulations at 36 C.F.R. Part 800, the staff of the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer has reviewed the aforementioned draft environmental impact statement ("DEIS"), which was received on a digital video disc ("DVD") on October 30, 2012, for this project in Monroe and Morgan counties in Indiana. According to the Indiana Department of Transportation's ("INDOT's") undated cover letter, the comment deadline is January 2, 2013, and according to that letter and the title signature page of the DEIS, we are to submit comments to you.

Response:

Comment noted. Responses to specific comments follow.

AS004-02 **Comment:**

With regard to Volume I, Section 5.13 Historic Resource Impacts, we agree with the conclusions regarding above-ground properties that are listed in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places. Having concurred, in our November 21, 2012, letter that "that this project will not adversely affect any historic above-ground properties," we now concur, as well, with the DEIS's similar conclusion regarding impacts on historic above-ground properties. The North Clear Creek Landscape Historic District will perhaps see the most noticeable changes to its setting of any of the historic above-ground properties identified in Section 5 of I-69. We note that the explanation in Section 5.13 of why the North Clear Creek Historic Landscape District will not suffer an adverse impact from this project is more succinct than that in Section 5.6 of the documentation accompanying FHWA's October 11, 2012, finding of Adverse Effect for the project as a whole (see Appendix N of the DEIS). However, the lack of an adverse impact on the North Clear Creek Historic Landscape District was perhaps explained most succinctly by the paragraph in Appendix N, PDF page 57/87 that begins with the following statement: "Under CFR 800.5(a)(2)(v), there will be an '[i]ntroduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features,' but that introduction will not constitute an adverse effect."



Response:

Comment noted. Paragraph of the 800.11(e) has been amended to make it more succinct.

AS004-03 Comment:

Regarding archaeology, in Volume I, Section 5.14 Archaeology Impacts, we note that the Addendum Phase Ia and Ib archaeological report (Lombardi et al., 10/26/12) documented archaeological resources in the footprint of the proposed project area, and our office commented in detail on the report in our letter of November 19, 2012.

Response:

Comment noted. No further action is required at this time.

AS004-04 Comment:

If any archaeological artifacts or human remains are uncovered during construction, demolition, or earthmoving activities, state law (Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and -29) requires that the discovery be reported to the Department of Natural Resources within two (2) business days. In that event, please call (317) 232-1646. Be advised that adherence to Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and -29 does not obviate the need to adhere to applicable federal statutes and regulations.

If you have questions about archaeological issues, please contact Dr. Rick Jones at (317) 233-0953 or Rjones@dnr.IN.gov. Questions about buildings or structures should be directed to John Carr at (317) 233-1949 or jcarr@dnr.IN.gov. In all future correspondence regarding I-69 Section 5, please refer to DHPA No. 2123.

Response:

Comment noted. If archaeological artifacts or human remains are uncovered during construction, IDNR will be notified as provided in state law.

**AS005 12/28/2012 E-mail
Jason Randolph, Wetlands Project Manager, IDEM Office of Water Quality**

AS005-01 Comment:

Due to other priority projects and the holidays IDEM requests a two week extension on the submittal of our comments. It will probably be sooner than that but I am unsure what the level of review this will have to go through in our agency and the signature process due to the holidays. I will try and get it to you as soon as possible. Thank you and Happy New Years.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Response:

The public comment period on the DEIS was not extended; however, responses to comments received from IDEM in its January 11, 2013 letter follow.

AS006 **01/11/2013 Letter (I-69)**
Hollingsworth, IDEM

AS006-01 **Comment:**

The Office of Water Quality has reviewed the Tier 2 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Section 5 of the Interstate 69 Evansville to Indianapolis Project dated October 2012. The DEIS was reviewed for activities that fall within the regulatory authority of the Section 401 Water Quality Certification Program and the State Wetland Regulatory Program.

The proposed project will start at the terminus of Section 4 of I-69 at the SR 37 interchange in Monroe County and continues northward to SR 39 south of Martinsville in Morgan County. This section of the proposed highway is approximately 21 miles in length and uses the existing SR 37 alignment. The Tier 2 study corridor is approximately 2,000 feet in width and included several alternative alignments that were selected for study. According to the DEIS, you have selected Alternative 8 as the preferred alternative. Based on the corridor study and the proposed alternative alignments, the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) agrees with the selection of the preferred alternative within the Section 5 corridor. Below you will find specific comments related to the proposed project and preferred alternative.

Response:

Comment and agreement noted. Responses to specific comments follow.

AS006-02 **Comment:**

The minimal impact, typical cross sections for the proposed interstate will vary by location and consist of an urban typical (170.5 feet wide), suburban typical with adjacent access roads (312 feet wide), rural typical with adjacent access roads (312 feet wide), and a rural typical (180 feet wide). The right-of-way (ROW) for the proposed interstate will vary between 220 feet and 790 feet, depending on the alignment and terrain features. Based on the typical cross section, IDEM recommends ROW clearance is kept to the minimum necessary to construct the interstate facility in all areas that contain Waters of the State. Where feasible, cut and fill activities, which may require the widest ROW, should be located outside of these areas.

**Response:**

Right-of-way clearing will be kept to a minimum and include only that area necessary for construction. Cut and fill activities impacting Waters of the State have been minimized in finalizing the Refined Preferred Alternative for the FEIS and will continue to be minimized in subsequent post-NEPA design.

AS006-03 Comment:

Direct impacts associated with the project are estimated to be a total of 1,346.05 acres. Of this total, 972.68 acres consist of the existing SR 37 corridor and the additional 373.37 acres would be required to upgrade SR 37 to interstate status. As identified in the DEIS; approximately 70% of the land is currently developed, 5% is in agricultural land, and 24% is upland habitat. To reduce additional direct impacts, ensure all borrow and waste disposal sites are located in non-forested upland areas and at a distance from Waters of the State that will not result in secondary impacts such as draining wetlands, lowering the water table, and cutting off a watershed to a wetland. If borrow or waste disposal areas are to be located adjacent to streams with forested corridors; these areas should be located at a distance that will preserve the forested corridor.

Response:

Per INDOT Specifications, it is the contractor's responsibility to identify and obtain both water resource and archaeological clearances on all borrow and waste areas. If streams and/or wetlands are identified within the proposed borrow and waste areas, per INDOT Specifications, the Contractor is required to obtain all necessary permits for impacting these resources prior to use. Since IDEM does not consider borrow and waste areas as water dependent; IDEM may choose to decline to approve any water resource permitting for borrow and waste site requested by the Contractor for the I-69 Section 5 project.

AS006-04 Comment:

Approximately 465 stream segments were identified within the corridor. Of the 465 stream segments, 27 perennial streams, 38 intermittent streams, and 400 ephemeral streams were identified. It is estimated that 85,017 linear feet of stream exists within the preferred alternative of which 30,057 linear feet is natural stream (not including existing impacts from SR 37). Stream relocations associated with the preferred alternative are estimated to be 55,684 linear feet of stream channel. Riparian corridor loss associated with the preferred alternative is estimated to be between 106.10 and 119.69 acres. During stream crossing design, avoid using structures that will require the stream to be manipulated. All stream relocations should follow the natural stream channel design protocols unless the relocated stream is an existing riprap lined roadside ditch. If you are capturing a stream within the ROW, the outside ROW edge of the stream should be planted with trees and shrubs or located adjacent to existing forest areas to minimize the impacts of heat inputs associated with impervious surface.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Signage should be placed along all jurisdictional streams captured in the ROW during and after construction for both contractors and for highway maintenance staff. IDEM has been coordinating on this project and participating in field reviews for potential stream mitigation sites. However, during those field meetings, the actual stream impact numbers were not discussed due to the questionable jurisdictional status of some of the stream features. Therefore, additional meetings need to be held to discuss and finalize jurisdictional status and mitigation proposals before the FEIS is published or before the project goes to permitting.

Response:

Wherever practicable, INDOT will use structures that reduce and/or avoid stream manipulations. In all practicable areas where perennial and/or large intermittent streams require relocations, the relocations may be completed using natural channel stream designs using techniques similar to the ones used for Rosgen Natural Channel Stream Designs (i.e., cross vein structures, j-hook structures, 2-staged channel construction, natural stream bank stabilization using vegetation, etc...). In areas where natural channel stream designs are completed for perennial and/or larger intermittent channel relocations, it is anticipated that on-site mitigation will be proposed for these channels. Right-of-way and construction limits are constrained to avoid impacts by keeping the disturbance to streams at a minimum. However, there may be limited areas to complete the natural channel stream designs on captured channels and this also may limit the amount of planting that can occur along these channels.

“Do Not Disturb” and/or “Do Not Mow or Spray” signs may be placed along all jurisdictional channels within the right-of-way to avoid disturbance of these areas during routine highway maintenance activities. The exact location of these signs will be determined during the final design phase of the project.

A meeting with both the USACE and IDEM was held on January 28, 2013 to discuss the stream impacts and jurisdictional status of the channels potentially impacted by this project. The FEIS reflects the results of this meeting. Additional meetings with the regulatory agencies will be held throughout the permitting and design phase of this project.

AS006-05

Comment:

Approximately 107 field verified wetlands were located within the study corridor totaling 83.19 acres. The 107 wetlands were further broken down by type and consist of 36 emergent, 21 forested, 5 scrub shrub, 43 unconsolidated bottom and 2 aquatic bed wetlands. The preferred alternative contains 13.13 acres of wetlands. As with stream mitigation, IDEM has been participating in field reviews for potential mitigation sites and believes that suitable wetland mitigation sites have been identified for this project.



Response:

Comment noted. The Refined Preferred Alternative in this FEIS impacts only 5.75 acres of wetlands, a decrease of 7.38 acres from the impacts of the DEIS Preferred Alternative.

AS006-06 Comment:

The preferred alternative would directly impact 110 karst features with 343.7 acres of impact. As stated in the DEIS, specific impacts to these resources will not be finalized until after conclusion of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. IDEM was very pleased with the format used for karst identification and agency coordination for Section 4 of I-69. This format should be utilized for Section 5. Jim Sullivan is the IDEM Office of Water Quality contact for karst related issues. Please continue to coordinate with Jim to ensure the process continues for Section 5. The DEIS does a good job highlighting the significance of Cave A and B. Ensure measures are designed to avoid changes in hydrology delivery to the cave system, and that measures are installed to pre-treat storm water run-off to the cave system. The DEIS does a good job of describing best management practices (BMP's) for karst resources, but must be further evaluated for site specific karst features.

Response:

As prescribed in the Karst MOU, further evaluation for site specific karst features, including consideration of avoidance, drainage, alternate drainage, and mitigation measures will be developed in consultation with Karst MOU signatories and will occur during the final design phase of the project. Under the Karst MOU, a monitoring and maintenance plan will be developed for affected karst features.

AS006-07 Comment:

The DEIS identified two superfund sites (Lemon Lane Landfill, Bennett's Dump) that will require special attention. Based on your discussions in the DEIS, you have coordinated with the parties associated with these sites and should continue to coordinate with them during the design and implementation of your project. In addition, continue to coordinate with Scott Johanson of the IDEM Office of Land Quality.

Response:

Comment noted. Coordination will continue with IDEM Office of Land Quality.

AS006-08 Comment:

Erosion and sediment control will be a crucial part of this project during construction in order to protect karst features and aquatic resources. As with previous sections of I-69, the DEIS is not specific on the measures that will be used to address storm water management. The DEIS uses general statements such as "BMP's will be used during



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

construction" or "silt fence or other erosion control measures" will be used. These statements are general in nature and are not sufficient to adequately address the pollutants that will be associated with active construction. Specific selection of measures; including design specifications must be incorporated into the project based on the terrain and the resource that is to be protected. The purpose of 327 IAC 15-5 (Rule 5) "is to establish requirements for storm water discharges from construction activities of one (1) acre or more so that the public health, existing water uses, and aquatic biota are protected." As part of Rule 5, it is a requirement to ensure that "sediment-laden water which otherwise would flow from the project site shall be treated by erosion and sediment control measures appropriate to minimize sedimentation". Specific detail, including sequencing must be provided as part of the construction plans required by Rule 5. All measures must be selected to protect aquatic resources on the project site as well as karst features. In addition to meeting the requirements of 327 IAC 15-5, the agency recommends that specific practices related to erosion and sediment control and storm water management be included in the FEIS especially in those areas with high topographic relief. The incorporation of more detailed information will provide the agency a better understanding of the proposed practices to be used and how each will function to address proposed wetland and stream impacts.

Response:

The project will follow Chapter 37 of the INDOT Design Manual and/or the IDEM Storm Water Quality Manual whichever is more stringent for each situation. The Contractor is required to develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for each individual project, as part of the construction plan required in 327 IAC 15-5 (Rule 5), which must be reviewed by INDOT Environmental Services and IDEM Wetlands and Storm Water Section for comments prior to any construction beginning. In addition, INDOT has a full time erosion and sediment control specialist dedicated to this project to help oversee that erosion and sediment control measures are being installed and measures are being modified based on field conditions to appropriately control erosion and sediment on the project site. Also, additional INDOT staff and other consultants have been identified to be in the field to complete contractor compliance inspections on a regular basis to help control erosion and sediment on the project.

AS006-09

Comment:

Within Section 5, the preferred alternative would require the construction of seven interchanges depending upon which option is selected. IDEM generally agrees with the interchange locations and types. IDEM supports Option B which would maintain the existing partial interchange at Walnut Street and SR 37. This option would avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands and provide a substantial cost savings. The proposed Sample Road interchange should be designed to avoid the karst features on both the east and west side of the existing SR 37 ROW.



Response:

Preference noted. Please refer to AF002-46 response regarding Walnut Street interchange. The partially folded diamond interchange at Sample Road has been included as part of the Refined Preferred Alternative to minimize impacts to the karst features in this area.

AS006-10 Comment:

In regards to the other activities that will impact Waters of the State, IDEM recommends that you continue to look at avoidance and minimization measures as you complete the National Environmental Policy Act process. Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to comment on this project. Should you have any questions about this letter, please contact Jason Randolph, Project Manager, of my staff at 317-233-0467, or you may contact the Office of Water Quality through the IDEM Environmental Helpline (1-800-451-6027).

Response:

Comment noted.



Local Government Comments

LG001 **12/10/2012 Letter**
Faron Livingston, Chief, Bloomington Township Department of Fire & Emergency Services

LG001-01 **Comment:**

Bloomington Township Department of Fire & Emergency Services
I-69 Impact, Observations and Concerns

From Station 15 (2115 W. Vernal Pike) we need east/west access on the new Vernal Pike overpass. Recommend a stoplight intersection from Crescent onto Vernal. This will give us the right of way as we attempt to go either direction on Vernal Pike/17th Street overpass.

Response:

The proposed overpass connecting Vernal Pike on the west side of I-69 to 17th Street on the east side of I-69 will provide connectivity and access. The proposed treatment at the intersection of 17th Street/Vernal Pike with Crescent Road is a stop sign on Crescent Road in the Refined Preferred Alternative. The intersection will be designed with turning radii required for a WB-50 design vehicle, as per IDM, Chapter 46. The intersection is not expected to meet MUTCD traffic signal warrants in the design year; however, the final determination as to intersection treatment will be made in conjunction with a signal warrant analysis during final design. Collaboration with emergency responders will continue during final design.

LG001-02 **Comment:**

We estimate an additional 5 to 10 minutes travel time because of the difference in types of road from 4-lane 37 to small bidirectional 2-lane roads in the northern part of Monroe County along Interstate I-69.

Response:

Further analysis and feedback received on National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) and potential emergency response route/ time impacts have been integrated into Section 5.3.5, *Community Facilities and Services*. INDOT acknowledges that converting SR 37 to I-69 would affect emergency and law enforcement response. INDOT is committed to continuing coordination regarding emergency response and law enforcement matters as the project progresses into final design, construction, and operation. FEIS Figures 5.3-11, 5.3-13, and 5.3-14 identify fire, ambulance, and police service/response areas; dispatch centers or sites; hospitals/medical centers; and Refined Preferred Alternative 8 features, closures, and access points. The location of possible interchanges and the treatment (grade separation, relocation, or closing) of local roads could affect fire, ambulance, and police responses. Furthermore, the change



in travel patterns related to road closings and re-routings could produce longer trips and slower response times for emergency responders. Conversely, the ability of emergency responders to reach major medical centers, such as Bloomington, Indianapolis, and Evansville, would be improved with I-69.

LG001-03 Comment:

A full interchange at the College Ave (Walnut Street) exit from 37 is a must, and ideally in addition to the Sample Road interchange we would have an interchange at Burma Road or at Chambers Pike in order to serve the people of northern Monroe County in a manner more in-line with NFPA 1702/03 which requires a response time of no more than 6 minutes.

Response:

See AF002-46 regarding Walnut Street interchange. INDOT will continue to coordinate with Monroe County to identify ways to improve local connectivity west of I-69 at Sample Road interchange as a separate local project (i.e., an extension of Lawson Road that would connect with Bottom Road -- a Monroe County project identified in the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan). This connection would provide access for the Waste Water Treatment Plant and Ellettsville as an additional route without using SR 46. Interchanges at Burma Road and Chambers Pike are not proposed. In regards the NFPA and response times, please refer to LG001-02 response. Please note the correct reference is NFPA 1710 and NFPA 1720 (as per followup coordination on February 20, 2013).

LG001-04 Comment:

[Attachment: 9/12/2012 e-mail (from Bomgardner):]

In response to your request at the I69 emergency services meeting held at Bloomington Township Fire Department on August 2nd, 2012 for routing times for emergency services, we have developed the following schedule and conclusions.

Alternate route travel times from Station 15 to various points west of Station 15 (2115 W. Vernal Pike)

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for copy of travel time data provided with this comment.]

Station 15 Monroe County

Conclusion:

From Station 15 we need east/west access on the new Vernal Pike overpass. Recommend a stoplight intersection from Crescent onto Vernal. This will give us the right of way as we attempt to go either direction on the Vernal overpass.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Response:

Thank you for providing this travel time data. Please refer to LG001-01, LG001-02 and PO002-05 responses.

LG001-05 Comment:

Alternate route travel times from Station 5 (5081 N. Old St. Rd. 37 to points west of 4-lane 37

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for copy of travel time data included with this comment.]

Response:

Thank you for providing this travel time data. Please refer to LG001-02 response.

LG001-06 Comment:

Section 5 Monroe County

Conclusions:

The new Chambers Pike overpass route will add approximately three minutes to our run time. Once we crossover Chambers Pike we will need a service road west of I-69 from the Sample Road interchange to Burma Road.

It is not possible to estimate the additional time it will take to travel the distance along the frontage road proposed from Sample Rd. or at the Chambers Pike overpass to points north without actually having that road in place. We estimate an additional 5 to 10 minutes travel time because of the difference in types of road from 4-lane 37 to a small bidirectional 2-lane road.

Response:

Please refer to LG001-03 response regarding connections from Sample Road interchange. The Refined Preferred Alternative continues to provide for a local access road on the west side of I-69 between Chambers Pike and Burma Road.

LG001-07 Comment:

A full interchange at the College Ave exit from 37 is a must, and ideally in addition to the Sample Road interchange we would have an interchange at Burma Road or at Chambers Pike.

Response:

Please refer to LG001-03 response regarding connections from Sample Road interchange. In addition, a road which satisfied Interstate highway (freeway) standards



requires substantial justification for providing an interchange; emergency response needs alone are not sufficient. Traffic forecasts at Burma Road and Chambers Pike do not support the inclusion of an interchange at either of these locations. . Interchange locations were evaluated based on traffic volumes from the I-69 corridor model and input from local government representatives, the Expert Land Use Panel, the Community Advisory Committee, and public input.

LG002 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Cheryl Munson, Incoming Monroe County Council / Monroe County Historic Preservation Board

LG002-01 **Comment:**

Thank you. A bit of confusion. In January, I will be a new member of the Monroe County Council, and so I signed up tonight to speak as an appointed government official for the Monroe County Historic Preservation Board. And many of you may have heard me speak before. I've spoken many times in opposition to Section 4, and tonight I wish to speak and urge construction of Section 5 because of public safety concerns and because of connectivity concerns for people commuting from the county into Bloomington; but that doesn't mean that everything is good and well with historic resources in Section 5. Our Board has prepared comments in detail, and we disagree with several findings. We concur with many others I should say.

Response:

Responses to comments related to cultural resources (above-ground and below-ground) are provided as an appendix to the 800.11(e) Documentation. Please reference Appendix I. *CORRESPONDENCE/COMMENTS RECEIVED/TRANSMITTED FOLLOWING SECTION 106 REVIEW PERIOD (OCTOBER 2012 TO JANUARY 2013)* of the 800.11.(e) Documentation, located in Appendix N, *Section 106 Documentation*, of the FEIS.

LG002-02 **Comment:**

Let me just tell you the points of disagreement. We disagree that there is no adverse effect on four important districts. These are the Maple Grove Road, National Register of Historic Places Rural District, the Hunter Valley Historic Landscape District, the Reed Historic Landscape District, and the North Clear Creek Historic Landscape District. The latter three are all significant for their importance -- Did I just run out of time? Oops! -- for their importance to the history of the limestone industry. And the effects will be -- caused by construction will be the erection of concrete barriers and steel guardrails, and we think this will be a terrible visual impact that could be alleviated by using traditional methods of barriers called quarry bluffs. Thank you.

Response:

Please refer to LG002-01 response.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

LG003 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Andy Ruff, Bloomington City Council

LG003-01 **Comment:**

Our local paper, the Herald Times, recently wrote that the obligation of the State is to finish State Road 37 north to Indianapolis. But it's -- the project isn't anywhere close to State Road 37 yet, so that's a premature obligation. The obligation now is to do the right thing for the citizens of Indiana. It's been obvious for a long time that the State cannot meet basic transportation and safety needs for Indiana and build this hugely expensive I-69 project, and now the governor and INDOT have been admitting it. And this recent call for novel funding, public/private partnership funding idea is just ultimately in some way or another needs tolls. The really big problem starts with staggering onward with Section 4, which still is not close to being built yet. It's the most costly and damaging section, and most of those costs and damages have not yet been realized. In building it to State Road 37 and then stopping there creates real problems for 37 users. That's the main artery for the entire region.

Response:

Please refer to PO018-16 response regarding funding. Construction for all of Section 4 is under contract, with funds for these contracts obligated.

LG003-02 **Comment:**

So quit praying for a miracle and step back and see if you can develop an actual plan, not a wish list, but a real plan that funds transportation needs for the State, the thousands and thousands of bridges that need attention, the regular repair and maintenance of existing roadways and addresses real safety needs instead of bankrupting our State's transportation funds for decades to come just for the one hugely expensive highway. Stop at Crane. Have a road that serves Crane, to Evansville, to I-64. Quit throwing good money after bad in Section 4 and avoid the much worse situation of stopping at State Road 37. Thank you.

Response:

Please refer to LG003-01 response regarding status of Section 4 project.

LG004 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Kevin Enright, Monroe County Surveyor

LG004-01 **Comment:**

My fellow Americans, welcome. It's good to be here, and it's good to be reminded that we are, despite our differences, all members of this great country and that we are here because of our pride in this fact.



Mary Jo, welcome. Baker Associates were the engineers for the Corridor 18 study. I've been involved in the I-69 debate for 20 years. In 2003 I had taken their study and had done an analysis of the national I-69. I gave my results in the press release that showed that the I-69 as it's proposed is going to be 84 miles longer than existing highways from Canada to Mexico. At the time the Federal Highway Administration said that my findings were premature speculation.

So now it's nine years later. We haven't heard response yet to my findings about this, and they can't respond to it because what I was saying then was the truth. If what they were saying telling us that we needed a shortcut, this new highway, was a lie, what was the truth?

Response:

As the commenter notes, this information was provided during the Tier 1 study, and was considered at that time. This comment was submitted on February 2, 2004 (comment number 0202087) and documented in the *I-69 Tier 1 Record of Decision, Additional Supporting Documentation*. It was addressed in Response 5 on page 6 of the *Responses to FEIS Comments* in this technical documentation. No further response to this Tier 1 issue is required.

LG004-02 Comment:

And at that time I began another study. What I do is study plans. And I was studying the U.S. plans for its nuclear material, its future, and this is an analysis of Barack Obama's Blue Ribbon Commission for America's Nuclear Future. The two main contractors for the United States, SAIC Corporation and USA Repository Services, have recently built plants at the west Crane gate along I-69. And is this the real reason why we are getting I-69 through our community?

Response:

Please refer to LG016-04 response.

**LG005 12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)
Senator Mark Stoops, State Senator District 40, Bloomington, Monroe County**

LG005-01 Comment:

Thank you. I'm Mark Stoops, State Senator, representing District 40, Bloomington, Monroe County. I've just spent two days in Indianapolis going over state finances and the budget requirements over the next two years. In looking at INDOT's finances for one, it just boggles my mind that the State of Indiana has spent the amount of money it has on I-69. And just to give you an example, there's an argument going on in Indianapolis about providing training service from outlying suburbs of Indianapolis and a connecting transit system. That is going to cost approximately the same amount that it



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

will cost to run I-69 from Greene County to the southern end of Bloomington, about a billion dollars. And for some reason we don't even bat an eye when it's a matter of road infrastructure.

Response:

Financing for transportation projects considers needs throughout Indiana. Transit service in the Indianapolis region would not address the core needs identified in the I-69 Tier 1 Study (an improved connection from Evansville to Indianapolis, improved regional accessibility in Southwest Indiana, and improved international and interstate freight movements). See Tier 1 FEIS, Chapter 2, *Purpose and Need*. Please refer to PO018-16 response regarding project funding for Section 5.

LG005-02

Comment:

Now, INDOT hoodwinked our local metropolitan planning organization by telling us that we had to support I-69 from Greene County or Section 4 to Bloomington and when in fact that was not true. Our MPO could have voted no, and I-69 would have stopped at 231 in Greene County. But we were led to believe the opposite, and it was only after research and after a vote to allow I-69 to proceed that it has proceeded. It's an incredible waste of money. And I think the promises -- people want to believe that I-69 will bring economic development, but what it will really bring is it will soak up all of the economic development from the areas around I-69, all those areas in southwest Indiana that already have a lower -- or a higher unemployment rate and lower economic -- and economic development activity. Sorry.

Response:

This information was considered during the Tier 1 study, and it was determined that that there is an overall increase in economic development throughout Southwest Indiana due to I-69. See I-69, Tier 1 FEIS, Section 3.4.4. No further response to this Tier 1 issue is required.

LG005-03

Comment:

One thing we need to look at with Section 5 is what's going to happen to the 67 corridor? What's going to happen to the economic development along the 67 corridor when Section 5 is built out? And I believe, again, all you will see is a soaking-up effect bringing it to Section 5. Thank you.

Response:

Please refer to LG005-02 response.



LG006 **12/19/2012 Letter**
Faron Livingston, Chief, Bloomington Township Department of Fire & Emergency Services

LG006-01 **Comment:**

Bloomington Township Department of Fire & Emergency Services
I-69 Impact, Observations and Concerns

In addition to the surveys, route and response time information submissions, previous comment and concern letters, and emails submitted to the various people requesting and responsible for collecting these documents for the proposed section 5 of the I-69 project; Bloomington Township Fire Department would like to submit additional comments for this project concerning access for motor vehicle accidents and hazardous materials incidents, road weight limit and size construction on the proposed local access roads, and other issues.

Response:

INDOT and the I-69 Section 5 Project Team appreciate the involvement of Bloomington Township Department of Fire & Emergency Services in the I-69 Section 5 project. Responses to specific comments follow:

LG006-02 **Comment:**

Local access road construction weight and size concerns

Simply stated; our concern is the construction of local access roads be designed in such a manner as to accommodate our heaviest truck and truck with the widest turning radius. The weight of our heaviest truck is 57,000 pounds and the widest turning radius of all our apparatus is 48 feet.

Response:

All access roads will be built to INDOT standards in regard to load limits. Minimum turning radii of 50 feet will be provided as per IDM, Chapter 46, which is suitable for the traffic using local access roads including emergency response apparatus and equipment. These details will be finalized during the final design phase.

LG006-03 **Comment:**

Access for accidents and hazardous materials incidents

Our headquarters station is located at 5081 N. Old State Road 37 and accesses State Road 37 via business 37 (Walnut Street) for points north and utilizes the crossover cut approximately 200 yards north of the on-ramp to access incidents south on State Road 37 and west on Bottom Rd. Additionally, incidents that occur in the south bound lane of State Road 37 or to the west of the state road at points north are accessed by exiting road accesses. Current plans for I69 section 5 have no provisions for accessing incidents



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

in the south bound lanes for miles at a time. This situation is unacceptable. Access must be provided at regular intervals to access incidents in both the north and south bound lanes of I69. This may be accomplished by constructing crossovers at regular intervals of no more than 3 miles each to allow access for emergency vehicles to respond to emergency incidents in both the north and south bound lanes.

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for copy of marked up maps of Preferred Alternative 8 showing crossover locations for EMS. An e-mail was also provided 12/19/2012 noting that these comments were provided to the I-69 office.]

Response:

Median cross-overs for emergency use will be constructed on proposed I-69. INDOT and FHWA have specific guidelines that determine the spacing of these cross-overs. Exact locations will be determined in final design and coordinated further with local emergency response agencies at that time.

LG006-04

Comment:

Walnut street interchange

The Walnut Street interchange must be a full interchange to allow access to emergency incidents in both the north and south bound lanes of I69 and to points west in the county accessed by Bottom Road.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-46 response regarding Walnut Interchange and LG001-03 response regarding connections from Sample Road interchange.

LG006-05

Comment:

Turkey Track inside Monroe County

The maps provided indicating those properties that will be acquired by the state, or that will have access provided by local access roads do not show how we will be able to access the properties at the northern most part of the county along the west side of I69 on Turkey Track Road. Indications are, we will have to travel several miles into Morgan County to access the local access road that serves Turkey Track within Monroe County. This situation is unacceptable.

Response:

Please refer to LG001-02 response. This specific issue will be the subject of coordination continuing into final design. In Section 1 of I-69, reciprocity agreements among neighboring emergency response providers addressed issues such as those cited here. See Section 1 Tier 2 FEIS, Section 5.3.5, *Community Services and Facilities*.



LG007 **1/2/2013 E-mail (Baker)/Letter**
Tom Micuda and Adrian Reid, Planning Director and City Engineer, City of Bloomington

LG007-01 **Comment:**

[1/2/2013 Email submittal (Micuda):]

Hello, Mary Jo. Attached are the comments that the City has put together concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Interstate 69 project. Please don't hesitate to let us know if you have any questions about the information we've provided. Thanks.

[1/2/2013 Letter:]

Introduction

The City would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and Preferred Alternative proposed in the Draft. The following pages contain the City of Bloomington's comments regarding the Preferred Alternative. Many of the comments in this document reflect previous correspondence we've submitted to Michael Baker and INDOT concerning this project. Certainly, we will continue to work with you and INDOT on design specifics if the project advances to the FEIS and ROD.

Response:

INDOT and the I-69 Section 5 Project Team appreciate the involvement of the City of Bloomington, (and the City of Martinsville, the Town of Ellettsville, and Monroe and Morgan counties) as participating agencies and look forward to your continued involvement in design.

LG007-02 **Comment:**

Tapp Road

The City supports the split diamond interchange at Tapp Road and 2nd Street. In addition, we submit the following comments regarding Tapp Road:

- The City accepts the proposed closure of Tech Park Blvd./ Rex Grossman Blvd. with the understanding that Deborah Drive then becomes the only access into both the Southern Indiana Medical Park and Public Investment Corporation properties on the south and north sides of Tapp Road respectively.
- The City proposes that INDOT extend the City's multi-use path on the north side of Tapp from its western terminus to and across the bridge.
- On the south side of Tapp Road, the City's preference is for a five (5) foot wide sidewalk separated from the roadway with a five (5) foot grass/tree plot and 6" concrete curb.
- We are requesting that the multi-use path be a minimum of ten (10) feet width and separated from the roadway with a 6" concrete curb.



- The City's current project on Tapp Road ends at Deborah Drive. The multi-use path ends there as well, so our request is for the work on the interchange to connect to the path.
- If a median is constructed on the interchange approaches at Tapp, the City requests landscaping treatments for the median and would be willing to work with INDOT on an agreement regarding the plant material and maintenance of such a landscaped median.

Response:

For the Refined Preferred Alternative, no changes are proposed on the east side of I-69 from the DEIS Preferred Alternative. On the west side of I-69, access for Barger Lane is proposed to change. Barger Lane will connect to Danlyn Road to access Tapp Road. The Refined Preferred Alternative provides for the bridge at Tapp Rd. to accommodate a multi-use path on the north side of the bridge and sidewalk on the south side. Tapp Road includes a 10 foot wide multi-use path on the north side and a 5 foot wide sidewalk separated from the roadway with a 5 foot grass buffer. On the west side of I-69, a 5' sidewalk is provided from the ramp to the west end of the project. How far to the east the multi-use path continues will be determined during final design; this also applies to median designs. INDOT will work with the city to develop a possible agreement regarding plant material and (if applicable) the maintenance of such a landscaped median.

LG007-03

Comment:

2nd Street

The City supports the split diamond interchange at Tapp Road and 2nd Street. In addition, we submit the following comments regarding 2nd Street:

- The Preferred Alternative shows the existing entrance to Sam's Club and the former Wal-Mart building being removed in lieu of the proposed access lane(s) extending south from 2nd to Tapp. City Planning has recently become aware of a potential business which would occupy the old Wal-Mart site. We are concerned that removal of this existing access point in favor of sole commercial access via a neighborhood street (Hickory Leaf Drive) will hurt business viability and create unnecessary congestion.
- The City's preference for bicycle and pedestrian facilities on 2nd Street would be similar to those on Tapp Road. We are requesting that the path be a minimum of ten (10) feet wide and separated from the roadway with a 6" concrete curb.
- These bicycle and pedestrian facilities should be extended from the west side of Basswood Drive to the west side of Liberty Drive.
- If a median is constructed on the interchange approaches at 2nd Street, the City requests landscaping treatments for the median and would be willing to work with INDOT on an agreement regarding the plant material and maintenance of such a landscaped median.



Response:

The Refined Preferred Alternative includes a new right-in/right-out access point to serve Sam’s Club and the newly opened Rural King (former WalMart), in addition to the existing access via Hickory Leaf Drive. Plans are to use the existing bridge with a new bridge deck to provide a multi-use path on the north side and sidewalk on the south side of the bridge. SR 45/2nd Street will include a 10 foot wide multi-use path on the north side and a 5 foot wide sidewalk separated from the roadway with a 5 foot grass buffer. These facilities will extend from Liberty Drive on the west to Basswood Drive on the east. A raised median is not proposed on SR 45/2nd Street.

LG007-04 Comment:

Wapehani

The mainline of the proposed Interstate contains one option that impacts this City Park Facility and a second option which shifts the mainline west to avoid any disturbance. This second option creates greater impacts to properties west of the proposed Tapp Road interchange. The City is in the process of evaluating these two alternatives and will soon be providing INDOT the results of this evaluation. For this DEIS stage, we simply note the potential impacts of the Interstate mainline on the City's natural resource.

Response:

Since this comment was submitted, FHWA, INDOT, and the City of Bloomington have executed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) which provided City concurrence in use of the park property and outlined mitigative measures. As such, the Refined Preferred Alternative reduces impacts west of I-69 with *de minimis* impacts to the Wapehani Mountain Bike Park. Please also refer to FEIS Chapter 8, *Section 4(f)*, and Appendix QQ, *Wapehani MOA*, for further details.

LG007-05 Comment:

Dedicated Bike/Ped Bridge

The City's first priority is seeing that bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are made at the 2nd Street and 3rd Street interchanges. We also support the concept of a dedicated bike/ped bridge, while noting that there is more information that needs to be considered beyond the DEIS stage in this process. As a result, we believe that the bike/ped bridge idea may further develop as the process continues, and we support that effort to the maximum extent feasible. Our top concern, however, is the provision of safe, comfortable bicycle and pedestrian accommodations across the interstate at 2nd and 3rd Streets.



Response:

Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are provided at both the 2nd and 3rd Street interchanges. Please refer to LG007-03 and LG007-06 responses. A dedicated bicycle/pedestrian bridge is not included as part of the Section 5 project.

LG007-06

Comment:

3rd Street

The City supports maintaining the interchange at 3rd Street but has serious concerns regarding traffic of all modes.

- The City Engineering Department sent traffic count and signal timing information to INDOT's traffic consultant (BLA). The results of BLA's microsimulation likely will indicate traffic issues which the City has been observing particularly on 3rd Street with westbound backups due to the State's coordinated system giving preference to SR 37 and with phasing issues at the City's signal at Franklin Drive. The City reiterates its previous commentary to Michael Baker and INDOT that the signal at Franklin will likely impact traffic in the interchange and should be considered in the interchange plans in terms of either its removal or reduction in its phases.
- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities through this interchange will be very challenging given the high volume of traffic. The City constructed on-street bicycle facilities and sidewalk on both the north and south sides of 3rd Street as part of its recently completed West 3rd Street project. However, given the high volume and speed, the City's preference for the interchange would be to transition the bike lanes to an off-street, multi-use path on both sides.
- Our preference is for a 10 ft. wide multi-use path separated from the roadway with a 6" concrete curb and buffered by a 5 ft. shoulder.
- Alternatively, the City would also be satisfied with an on-street facility, specifically a 10-12 ft. buffered bike lane with 6 ft. wide sidewalk on the outsides of the bike lanes.
 - Our preference in either case should use NACTO guidelines.
 - The City is in the process of implementing its Greenways Implementation Plan. One of the facilities included in the plan is for West 3rd Street between Franklin and Liberty Drive. The plan proposes that the City and INDOT coordinate to reduce lane widths in order to provide on-street bike lanes in both directions.
 - Both Bloomington Transit and Rural Transit provide service along the 3rd Street corridor, on both sides of the interchange. This amplifies the need for safe, comfortable bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- The bike/ped facilities should extend from the west side of Franklin Drive to the west side of Liberty Drive.
- The City constructed a landscaped median as part of its West 3rd Street project. The medians west of our project limits, i.e. those maintained by INDOT, do not look appealing. If a median is constructed on the interchange approaches at 3rd Street, the City requests landscaping treatments for the medians and would be willing to

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

work with INDOT on an agreement regarding the plant material and maintenance of such a landscaped median.

Response:

Modifications to the DEIS interchange at 3rd Street have been made in the Refined Preferred Alternative to address the traffic concerns at this location through the design year of 2035. These include modifications to add lanes to existing ramps, as well as added turn lanes on SR 48/3rd Street. Bicycle-pedestrian facilities will be provided on both sides of 3rd Street through the interchange as requested. The existing bridge will be widened to provide a 10 foot bicycle/pedestrian path on each side, with 5 foot shoulders plus curb and gutter. These bicycle/pedestrian facilities will be provided between Gates Drive and Franklin Road. A raised median is not proposed on SR 48/3rd Street.

LG007-07**Comment:****17th Street / Vernal Pike**

The City supports the Preferred Alternative recommendation of an overpass connecting Vernal Pike on the west side of I-69 to West 17th Street on the east side.

- Access from Crescent Drive to 17th Street must be maintained. Unless traffic projections indicate otherwise, the City supports a stop control for Crescent Drive while through traffic on 17th Street does not stop. If traffic data indicate something more is needed in terms of traffic control, the City requests that a roundabout be evaluated.
- The City strongly reiterates its previous request that INDOT look at further improvements to 17th Street from the proposed project limits at Crescent to the western project limit of the City's proposed roundabout at the 17th/Arlington/Monroe intersection.
- The City also requests that INDOT look at further improvements to Crescent Road between 17th Street and Vernal Pike as this road will realize increased truck and vehicular traffic due to the closure of Vernal Pike at SR 37/I-69. With Vernal Pike proposed to dead end on the east side of I-69, the Crescent & Vernal intersection should be reconfigured so that eastbound traffic on Vernal stops for cross traffic traveling north-south on Crescent.
- The City's stated priority for improvements to these two local streets would be that 17th Street carries a higher priority than Crescent Road because of the inherent safety/geometric issues on 17th Street, particularly at Lindbergh Drive. Therefore, improvements should occur first (immediately) on 17th Street.
- The City's preferred cross section for 17th Street would be two 11 ft. wide travel lanes with a center TWLT lane (also 11 ft. wide) to match the recently constructed Vernal Pike section on the west side of I-69. A landscaped median would be an acceptable alternative to the TWLT lane where feasible.
 - On the South side of 17th, the City recommends a 6" curb, 5 ft. wide tree plot, and a 5 ft. wide sidewalk.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

- On the North side of 17th Street, the City prefers a 6" curb, 5 ft. wide tree plot, and 8 ft. wide multi-use path.
- If the TWLT lane is not feasible, the City would prefer the two-lane section with dedicated left turn lanes at intersections with other public streets.

Response:

Please refer to LG001-01 response regarding traffic control at the 17th Street/Crescent Road intersection. INDOT will consult with the City of Bloomington about the possibility of participating in additional improvements to 17th Street and Crescent Road; any such participation would be as part of a separate project from I-69 Section 5. Regarding the timing of projects on 17th Street and Crescent Road, since these would be local projects, decisions regarding their timing would be made by the City of Bloomington. Regarding the cross section on 17th Street, as the comment notes there are alternative possible approaches. These will be the subject of continuing discussions with the City of Bloomington, and may not be determined until final design. Within the construction limits of the I-69 project, the proposed cross section for 17th Street includes a 12-foot lane in each direction, with dedicated turn lanes as appropriate. It also includes a 5' sidewalk with a 5' buffer on the south side and an 8' multi-use path with a 5' buffer on the north side.

A portion of the requested improvements are outside of the I-69 project area. The Refined Preferred Alternative 8 does not include additional work between the 17th Street/Crescent Road intersection and the 17th Street/Arlington Road roundabout. Under the Refined Preferred Alternative 8, INDOT construction work for I-69 Section 5 will terminate with improvements to the intersection at 17th Street east of Crescent Road as a separate local project. INDOT has reviewed the cost estimate provided by the City of Bloomington for this work. Coordination between the two entities will continue regarding funding opportunities for this local project. The improvements requested are included as a project in the BMCMPPO's Long Range Transportation Plan.

LG007-08

Comment:

Acuff Road

The City supports the elimination of Acuff Road access along the east side of Interstate 69. With this access elimination, the intersection between Acuff Road and Prow Road will need to be improved with a horizontal curve that will allow for better traffic movements.

Response:

The Refined Preferred Alternative does not include any treatment to the existing intersection of Acuff Road and Prow Road. Pavement would be removed between I-69 and Prow Road. Coordination between INDOT and local agencies will be ongoing with decisions regarding improvements to local facilities as part of those discussions. It is likely that any commitments that come out of the coordination will be in the form of an



MOA between the local agency and INDOT with improvements being proposed as a separate local project from I-69 Section 5.

LG007-09 Comment:

Walnut Street

The City supports the Preferred Alternative Option which retains the partial interchange at Walnut Street with the extension of Sample Road west to Bottom Road (with partial use of Lawson Road) as discussed with INDOT Deputy Director Sam Sarvis in the Chamber of Commerce meeting on December 19, 2012. Essentially, the extension of Sample as requested by Monroe County would satisfy concerns regarding an alternative access to I-69 for residents of Ellettsville and northwest Monroe County. The City is supportive of the County's request and also supports retention of the partial interchange at Walnut Street. The partial interchange would allow existing access to Bloomington and IU to be maintained and provide a secondary entrance into Bloomington from the north, which is especially critical during large IU events such as graduation, move-in, and athletic events.

Response:

INDOT will continue discussions with Monroe County regarding participating in improvements to Sample Road west of I-69. It is likely that any commitments that come out of the coordination will be in the form of an MOA between the local agency and INDOT with improvements being proposed as a local project. This was discussed with Participating Agencies at their December 12, 2012 and January 20, 2013 meetings.

LG007-10 Comment:

General Comments

- The proposed cross-sections for Tapp Road, 2nd Street, 3rd Street, and 17th Street appear to have the flexibility to accommodate the bicycle and pedestrian facilities we have requested in many previous comments. The concerns we have spoken about in previous meetings and in previous comments are still valid in terms of user comfort. In the proposed locations where traffic volumes and speeds are higher, we propose using NAACTO standards, which the City's standards are based on.

Response:

The National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) has issued the Urban Bikeway Design Guide, Second Edition in 2012. The publication provides guidelines intended to create safe bicycling conditions rather than actual design standards. "Most of these treatments are not directly referenced in the current version of the AASHTO Guide to Bikeway Facilities, although they are virtually all (with two exceptions) permitted under the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)." The specific requests regarding bicycle/pedestrian accommodations received from the City of



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Bloomington and Monroe County follow the required features for conventional bike lanes as identified in the Urban Bikeway Design Guide, Second Edition.

As part of participating agency meetings and an additional coordination meeting held on April 30, 2013, INDOT has coordinated with the City of Bloomington and Monroe County about the specific design parameters of the bicycle/pedestrian facilities included within the project limits (see FEIS Table 7-2) and NACTO guidelines have been considered as part of this coordination. All bicycle and pedestrian facilities within the project limits will be designed to meet the requirements for sidewalks and Non-Motorized Vehicle Use Facilities as described in Chapter 51 of the Indiana Design Manual. ADA guidelines are incorporated into the Indiana Design Manual.

LG007-11 **Comment:**

- As stated in previous comments submitted to INDOT, the City concurs with the interchange locations as proposed in the preferred alternative.

Response:

Concurrence with interchange locations is noted.

LG007-12 **Comment:**

- The City would prefer the use of roundabouts over signals wherever possible for purposes of safety and traffic calming. Specifically, roundabouts should be examined at new interchanges such as Tapp Road, at new local intersections such as Crescent and 17th Streets, and as possible solutions to other traffic issues on 2nd and 3rd Streets.

Response:

No provision is made for use of roundabouts at new interchange locations. Sight distance is an important safety consideration where roundabouts are provided, and they need to be situated on a relatively flat area. A roundabout at Tapp Road would require significant changes in grades at this location; in addition, it likely would result in noticeably greater impacts to the Wapehani Mountain Bike Park. A roundabout was considered at the Crescent/17th Street location; however, this location is located on a grade such that providing a roundabout would result in several additional displacements. Where they are justified, signals are proposed in the Refined Preferred Alternative. Specific design details, including consideration of multiple options for intersection improvements, will be addressed during the final design phase.

LG007-13 **Comment:**

- Aesthetics are another important consideration for the City of Bloomington. The City submitted comments to that effect in April of 2012 and still have an interest in working with INDOT on bridge treatments, landscaped medians, tree plots, and



gateway opportunities (particularly at 3rd Street). The City would also be interested in partnering with INDOT to find appropriate places for public art opportunities.

- The Bloomington Chamber of Commerce has formed a subcommittee of its I-69 collaboration group for the express purpose of examining aesthetic treatments throughout Section 5 in Bloomington and Monroe County. Through this group, various aesthetic treatments will be specified, and the City is supportive of this group's efforts.

Response:

Aesthetic features will be determined in design as part of INDOT's commitment to incorporate context sensitive solutions (see Section 7.2, *Major Mitigation Initiatives*). Ongoing coordination with each community will occur as part of that process during final design activities.

LG007-14

Comment:

- Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations across I-69 are paramount even at interchanges proposed not to be altered. The City is committed to the provision of bike and ped connectivity throughout Bloomington and believes that the same can be accomplished with the interstate project. To that end, the City would consider entering an agreement with INDOT to share a portion of the funding for bike and pedestrian accommodations beyond the basic provisions proposed as part of the project.

Response:

Comment noted. As part of the Refined Preferred Alternative, bicycle/pedestrian accommodations have been incorporated into the SR 45/2nd Street interchange (see LG007-03) and into the SR 48/3rd Street interchange (see LG007-06).

LG007-15

Comment:

- Rule 5
 - Since Section 5 proposes conversion of an existing state route, the issue of local regulation of fill and borrow sites is less significant but still concerning to the City given limited staff resources to review and inspect any Rule 5 sites in City limits. It is unlikely that such sites will be adjacent to I-69, but there are some sites in City limits which could serve as fill or borrow sites. As these sites are largely unknown until after bid letting, the City requests as much advance notification as possible. In the event that a significant number of these sites are operating in the City's MS4 boundaries, the City may request assistance in some fashion.



Response:

Specific construction contracts will be determined as part of final design. INDOT will continue the coordination with the City of Bloomington and Monroe County and if a specific fill or borrow site for a particular contract is identified during that coordination process, this information can be provided as part of notification to interested contractors. Ultimately, the successful contractor will be responsible for securing fill/borrow sites and fulfilling Rule 5 (327 IAC 15-5) requirements associated with these. INDOT is its own MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permittee.

LG007-16

Comment:

- Construction
 - The City requests that any potential construction plans and phasing be reviewed and approved by the City Engineering Department and other emergency response agencies. INDOT's Bypass Project utilized their Partnering program for the duration of construction. These bi-weekly meetings were valuable to the City to coordinate construction-related activities, and the City strongly recommends implementing this program if Section 5 is constructed.
 - The most significant concern with potential Section 5 construction is how the improvements to existing 37 would be sequenced. At this point, INDOT may have some idea whether improvements occur all at once or are built in a piecemeal fashion. The impacts are very different between these two scenarios, so the City has concerns regarding sequencing. For instance, if access to both the 3rd and 2nd Street interchanges were under construction simultaneously, the City would have serious traffic issues. Also, there likely are scenarios whereby INDOT may require usage of local roads as detour routes. As a result, the City requests to be included in the coordination of construction sequencing as early in the design process as possible.
 - A number of quarries operate in Bloomington, the City is concerned with significantly more truck traffic to and from these areas and the impact that this additional traffic will have on the condition of local streets. Again, this will not be known until potential bid lettings occur, but the City would ask for consideration of truck routes to and from the I-69 project as well as periodic monitoring for damages caused by project-related truck traffic.
 - The Monroe County Highway Department should also review truck routes related to potential construction to assure bridge weight limit restrictions are adhered to for bridges in their inventory.

Response:

On-going coordination with will continue, although the participating agency process itself concludes with the completion of the Record of Decision. The City of Bloomington, Monroe County and Morgan County will be provided an opportunity to review final design plans prior to construction. Project sequencing and timing will be determined



once the procurement process is completed. Possible construction sequencing is outlined in Appendix FF, Construction Sequencing and Prioritization. The innovative finance and delivery team may offer an alternative sequencing plan for review and acceptance by INDOT. Contract documents will specify that access points to adjacent cross roads will not be closed at the same time.

LG007-17 Comment:

- Utility Coordination
 - INDOT also implemented a utility coordination process for the Bypass project which worked very well in our opinion. INDOT hired someone to oversee all of the utility coordination with the exception (at first) of City of Bloomington Utilities. Having this oversight expedited utility relocation work. The City requests inclusion of both City Engineering and City Utilities Department staff in utility relocation coordination if INDOT were to conduct the I-69 project in the same manner as the Bypass. Tim Muench and James Culbertson at INDOT are contacts at INDOT who have intimate knowledge of utility coordination on the Bypass project.
 - Relocation work involving City of Bloomington Utilities (CBU) requires review and approval by CBU's Engineering Department to ensure adherence to their standards and specifications which can be found at <https://bloomington.in.gov/documents/viewDocument.php?documentid=149>. Among other rules, CBU requires oversight of installation of their facilities by an in-house inspector to ensure that their facilities are properly tested and constructed.

Response:

There will be ongoing utility coordination with INDOT representatives and the utility companies within the project corridor during final design and construction. The City will be invited to participate in this coordination process.

LG007-18 Comment:

- Noise
 - The City has a local noise ordinance, and INDOT has been considerate of this ordinance during past projects such as the Bypass expansion. The City respectfully requests adherence to this ordinance for any part of I-69 construction occurring within City limits. The City's noise ordinance reads as follows:
 - 14.09.040- Exemptions.
The following uses and activities shall be exempt from the provisions of this chapter:

(b) Construction operations for which building permits have been issued or construction operations for which a permit is not required shall be



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

exempt from the noise control ordinance under the following conditions and with the following exceptions:

(1) Such operations that occur after six a.m. and before ten p.m., except on Sundays and holidays, as defined in Section 14.09.020. However, in recognition of the work necessary to prepare and close a site each day, motor vehicles transporting heavy construction equipment or construction materials to and from construction sites at those times shall be exempt from the time restrictions set forth above.

(2) Because of the loud and unusual sounds, and the ground vibrations associated with pile drivers, steam shovels, pneumatic hammers, and steam or diesel gasoline hoists, the operation of this equipment shall be exempt but only when it occurs between the hours of seven a.m. and eight p.m. or when allowed by special permit.

(3) In order to be exempt, all equipment used in such operations shall be operated with the manufacturer's mufflers and noise reducing equipment in use and in proper operating condition;

- Permission to operate outside of these parameters must be obtained from the City of Bloomington Board of Public Works. We would also suggest that INDOT contact Indiana University regarding critical dates for heavy traffic events such as move-in week, commencement, and football games.

Response:

INDOT and its contractors will coordinate closely with the City of Bloomington during construction activities regarding hours of construction activities, especially those which will result in significant increases in noise levels above ambient conditions. Regular coordination meetings will be held among INDOT, its contractors, and local officials during all periods of construction. INDOT will request involvement of Indiana University in these coordination meetings to receive information about heavy traffic events at the university.

LG007-19

Comment:

Consistency of Project with City and MPO Transportation Policy Documents

After reviewing the DEIS, the City notes that accommodations for additional modes of transportation, namely pedestrians, bicycles, and public transit, have not yet been provided to the same degree as for motor vehicles. The City believes that such accommodations must be made in the name of public safety.

Bloomington has historically planned for all modes and has been nationally recognized as a community which wholeheartedly seeks to accommodate all modes of transportation. This planning can be found in the 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

(LRTP), the MPO Complete Streets Policy, I-69/SR37 Alternative Transportation Corridor Study (ATCS), the SR37 Grade Separated Crossing Feasibility Analysis and Design project, Bloomington Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation and Greenways System Plan (2001, amended 2008), Bloomington Master Thoroughfare Plan (2002), Breaking Away: Journey to Platinum (2011), and the Bloomington Public Transportation Corporation Transit Development Program Update (2009). These documents address the specifics of how bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities will be constructed in order to provide access to either side of I-69/SR 37.

The City respectfully requests that the following comments concerning the Tier 2 DEIS be addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement and the subsequent Record of Decision.

Response:

INDOT has worked closely with the City of Bloomington and other local governments through the participating agency process. As part of this process, INDOT has sought opportunities to partner with the City of Bloomington to address the full range of transportation needs in the City of Bloomington. At the same time, the primary purpose of the I-69 project is to upgrade SR 37, which already has many of the characteristics of a fully access controlled freeway. The primary purpose of the project is to build an Interstate highway which increases regional accessibility, relieves traffic congestion, increases travel safety, facilitates the movement of motor freight and supports economic development. In doing so, INDOT also needs to minimize the impacts and costs of the project. All of these factors are evaluated in considering how the I-69 project can support other modes of travel.

LG007-20**Comment:****Tier 2 DEIS: Chapter 2, Section 1: Statement of Purpose and Need**

The I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies, Section 5 Draft Environmental Impact Statement references nine specific goals from the Tier 1 Study that have been carried forward into this Tier 2 Study (Chapter 2, Section 2.1, pp 2-2 to 2.3). Of these nine goals, Goal 2, "Improve Personal Accessibility for Southwest Indiana Residents" has an important role in determining many impacts and potential mitigation strategies for Section 5. Goal 5, "Increase accessibility for Southwest Indiana businesses to labor, suppliers, and consumer markets", also has an important role in determining accessibility impacts. However, the relationship of these two goals towards the four local needs identified is not clearly established (Chapter 2, Section 2.1, p 2.4). While the other specific Tier 1 goals have an intuitive relationship to these local needs, Goal 2 and Goal 5 do not. Therefore, Goal 2 and Goal 5 should be included as a fifth local "accessibility" need or clearly incorporated into one of the four current identified needs. This recommendation would be consistent with both local and previous I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis studies. Furthermore, Table 2-2: Section 5 Goals and Performance Measures (Chapter 2, Section 2.5, p 2-24) should adequately reflect any changes to local accessibility needs and specifically address the relationship of Goal 2 and Goal 5



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

regardless. At the very least, an explanation is needed as to why both Goal 2 and Goal 5 were not carried forward and any respective performance measures were not developed.

Response:

The two Tier 1 goals cited in this comment are particularly regional in nature. They measured changes in access among major regional population and business centers. These were translated into Tier 2 goals in the EISs for Sections 1 through 4. In those EISs, they were evaluated by considering how different interchange options affected access of study area population to the Interstate system, and how different interchange options improved access to regional business destinations such as Evansville, Bloomington, and Indianapolis.

The Section 5 project is different in that it passes directly through a major urban area (Bloomington), then serves a very rural section of Monroe County before terminating at Martinsville. Various interchange options would not meaningfully change the access which study area residents would have to other regional destinations (such as Evansville or Indianapolis), nor would they provide meaningfully different access to the Interstate System. Since all alternatives would perform equally with respect to these two Tier 1 goals, corresponding Tier 2 performance measures were not calculated. This rationale is documented more completely in FEIS Section 2.3.

LG007-21

Comment:

Tier 2 DEIS: Chapter 2, Section 2.4: Other Local Plans and Studies; Chapter 4, Section 2: Human Environment (Community Impact Assessment)

The following are local studies and plans that the City believes should be included within Chapter 2 of the Section 5 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Additionally, these documents should be examined in the Chapter 4 discussion because they provide important considerations for the Human Environment and more specifically acknowledge both existing and future needs for all modes of transportation. The subsection on Community Facilities and Services (Chapter 4, Section 2, Subsection 2.5, pp 4.2-43 to 4.2-54) does not do enough to identify access and mobility needs for both existing and anticipated future bicycle, pedestrian, and transit users.

Bloomington Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation and Greenways System Plan (2001. amended 2008)

This plan is adopted as part of the Growth Policies Plan and identifies various existing and planned infrastructure needs for bicycle and pedestrian transportation, including facilities within the 2000 foot I-69 Section 5 study area. The plan also provides prioritization, policy direction, and design considerations for these facilities. At a minimum, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility map (p 9 of the Plan is attached) should be referenced for various needs and impacts associated with Section 5 and a preferred design alternative.



Bloomington Master Thoroughfare Plan (2002)

This plan is adopted as part of the Bloomington Growth Policies Plan and identifies local functional road classifications, location and construction standards for all existing and proposed right-of-ways (IC 36-7-4-506), typical roadway characteristics, and priorities for the right-of-way.

Breaking Away: Journey to Platinum (2011)

This report was commissioned by the City of Bloomington Common Council and identifies facilities for bicyclists among many other recommendations set to make Bloomington one of the best bicycle friendly communities in America. The report focuses on methods within Engineering, Education, Enforcement, Encouragement, and Evaluation and Planning as a means for Bloomington to become a Platinum level Bicycle Friendly Community. Many on-street bicycle facilities are identified within the 2000 foot I69 Section 5 study area.

Wapehani Mountain Bike Park: Resolution 11-27 (2011)

Resolution 11-27 of the Redevelopment Commission of the City of Bloomington Indiana, which is attached, provides \$30,000 in support of the Breaking Away Journey to Platinum recommendation to make Wapehani a regional draw for mountain bike enthusiasts as a IMBA (International Mountain Biking Association) designated Gateway Trail System. Improvements include, trail rerouting, new trail development, trail features, and other park improvements. Most of the labor is reliant upon dedicated volunteers and most improvements of phase one, of a three phase plan, have been completed. Gateway Trail Systems aim to serve youth and family-friendly mountain biking riders in close proximity to urban areas. They can be built in small parks at a reasonable cost, and with a minimal environmental footprint. Wapehani uses a series of looped trails designed for beginner, intermediate, and expert riders. Future activities include sanctioned mountain bike races and other community events.

Bloomington Greenways Implementation Plan (2012)

This bicycle facility feasibility and design document provides cross-sections, project designs, and design guidelines for a comprehensive list of various bicycle infrastructure throughout Bloomington, including locations within the I-69 study area.

Bloomington Public Transportation Corporation Transit Development Program Update (2009)

This report identifies the longer-term plan for Bloomington Transit to accommodate the city's growth and future changes in land use and travel patterns. The study concludes most job growth is anticipated west of SR 37 (IU and the Downtown will still account for a significant portion) and travel demand in the southwest part of the city will also experience great increases. Six transit service gaps are identified, two of which transect the I-69 corridor. An attached map from this Program Update has been included and represents projected Year 2030 transit trips. A pattern of west-east movement on either side of the projected I69 corridor is quite apparent. The report recommends various local, cross-town, and corridor service improvements. Service improvements consider



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

both access and mobility of transit service and transit users alike while factoring in various operations and maintenance elements.

Annual BMCMPO Crash Reports

Annual crash data is analyzed and summarized in both one year and three year time series. The reports identify numerous locations within the 2000 foot I69 Section 5 study area that have a high incidence of crashes and present an array of transportation safety concerns.

BMCMPO Complete Streets Policy (Adopted January 2009)

The Bloomington/Monroe County MPO's commitment to transportation planning regardless of age, mode, or ability in all future transportation projects is evidenced by the passing of a Complete Streets Policy in January 2009 (Please see attachment for the adopted policy).

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for copy of attachments, including: City of Bloomington Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation and Greenways System Plan Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Network; 11-27 Resolution of the Redevelopment Commission of the City of Bloomington Indiana; Exhibit 10-Travel Patterns in 2030; Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization Adoption Resolution FY 2009-08]

Response:

References to these additional local plans and studies have been incorporated into Chapter 2, *Purpose & Need* and Section 4.2, *Human Environment (Community Impact Assessment)*. In addition, the Wapehani Mountain Bike Park resolution has been referenced in Chapter 8, *Section 4(f)*. FHWA and INDOT are cognizant of these additional plans referenced by the City and the Refined Preferred Alternative is as consistent as is reasonable and feasible in developing an interstate highway facility.

In terms of the annual BMCMPO crash report data, the I-69 Section 5 compares relative levels of crash reductions on the regional level, based upon changes in travel patterns under different interchange scenarios. Investigation of specific high-crash hotspots within the local transportation network managed by the City and the MPO are beyond the scope of the I-69 Section 5 study.

Regarding the BMCMPO's Complete Streets Policy, accommodations across I-69 are included at overpasses and interchanges within the limits of the I-69 Section 5 project. See Section 7.3.2, *Social and Neighborhood*, (Table 7-2) for a listing of pedestrian and bicycle-related commitments.

LG007-22

Comment:

[12/19/2013 (Micuda) followup e-mail:]



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Hello again, Mary Jo. Considering the importance of this correspondence as well as the January 2 deadline required for comments, please confirm that you have received this email on time. Thanks!

Response:

An e-mail response was provided to Mr. Micuda that his comments were received on time.

LG008 **1/2/2013 E-mail (Baker)/Letter**
Beth Rosenbarger, Active Transportation Committee, Monroe County

LG008-01 **Comment:**

[1/2/2013 e-mail transmittal (Rosenbarger)]

I have attached comments regarding Section 5 of I-69 on behalf of the Active Transportation Committee of Monroe County. Thank you for your time and consideration. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

[1/2/2013 letter]

As INDOT considers design options for Section 5 of I-69, the Active Transportation Committee of Monroe County would like to emphasize the importance of multi-modal connectivity. The highway will divide Bloomington’s western neighborhoods from the town center in addition to limiting east-west connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians throughout the county. The Active Transportation Committee urges INDOT to consider bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure to provide multi-modal access and connectivity across I-69.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-02, -03, -06 and -07 regarding incorporation of bicycle and pedestrian access within Bloomington across I-69.

LG008-02 **Comment:**

Issue:

Depending on which design options are constructed, the I-69 corridor could be a barrier for east/west access in Bloomington and Monroe County. Residents living west of the highway must cross it to access downtown Bloomington while residents east of the highway need to cross the highway to access the business district west of the highway. These roads carry high volumes of high-speed traffic, but also connect important destinations on both sides of IN-37. Providing multi-modal transportation options to all residents is a priority for the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, and Indiana University.



Response:

Accommodations across I-69 are included at overpasses and interchanges within the limits of the I-69 Section 5 project. See Section 7.3.2, *Social and Neighborhood*, (Table 7-2) for a listing of pedestrian and bicycle-related commitments.

LG008-03 Comment:

Existing conditions and facilities:

Second Street has a sidepath along the north side, to the east of IN-37 in development. There are no facilities on the south side. There are Bloomington Transit bus stops on both sides of IN-37; this increases pedestrian use of the area.

Response:

Comment noted.

LG008-04 Comment:

Third Street currently has bicycle lanes that begin east of IN-37 at Franklin Road and continue for approximately one mile to Landmark Road. More connections to the bike lanes are planned that will connect the lanes with downtown Bloomington. Third Street also has Bloomington Transit stops on both sides of IN-37.

Response:

Comment noted.

LG008-05 Comment:

Vernal Pike currently has a sidepath along the north side starting at Woodyard Road and continuing west. The City of Bloomington has planned a sidepath for the north side of Tapp Road.

Response:

Comment noted.

LG008-06 Comment:

Plan Support for Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities:

The Indiana University Campus, City of Bloomington, and Monroe County have each been recognized with Bicycle Friendly ratings from the League of American Bicyclists with Bronze, Silver, and Honorable Mention ratings, respectively. Additionally, several plans have stressed the importance of multi-modal transportation for the region. These plans include The Bloomington Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation and Greenways System Plan, The Monroe County Alternative Transportation and Greenways System



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Plan, Bloomington Growth Policies Plan, the 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan, the Complete Streets Policy, and the I-60/SR-37 Alternative Transportation Corridor Study.

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to LG007-21 response.

LG008-07

Comment:

Proposed Facility Options:

The following charts describe four alternatives for consideration to provide pedestrian and bicycle access across highway I-69. These facility considerations include the recommendation to build a pedestrian and bicycle bridge across the highway. For both 2nd and 3rd Streets, the minimum level of recommendations changes if no bicycle and pedestrian bridge is built. The bicycle and pedestrian bridge would most likely be constructed in the vicinity of these two streets, thereby providing an alternative for 2nd and 3rd Street users. These recommendations are based on the regional transportation plans, current and proposed facilities, and existing conditions.

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for included image of I-69: Multi-modal access at crossings; Infrastructure Recommendations tables for 2nd Street, 3rd Street, Vernal Pike, Tapp Road; Plan Summary table; and Plan Support for Recommendations tables for Bike Bridge, 2nd Street, 3rd Street, Vernal Pike, and Tapp Road.]

Response:

Please refer to Table 7-2 of the FEIS for a list of bicycle and pedestrian facilities included in the Refined Preferred Alternative. Design requirements for these facilities are discussed in LG007-10. A dedicated bicycle/pedestrian bridge is not included as part of the Section 5 project.

LG008-08

Comment:

Definitions

- Sidepath: hard-surface path physically separated from the road; separated from the road with grass, trees, or a curb; preferred minimum width of 8 feet.
- Sidewalk: hard-surface path within street right-of-way for pedestrian use; preferred minimum width of 5 feet.
- Sidewalk Buffer: median between roadway and sidewalk; can include grass, trees or other dividers or landscape features.
- Bike Lanes: placed on both sides of the street; minimum width of 4 feet, preferred width of 5 feet.
- Bike Lane Buffer: a painted buffer between the bicycle lane and the automobile lanes; minimum width of 3 feet.



Response:

Definitions have been noted.

LG009 **1/2/2013 E-mail (Baker)/Letter**
Dan Swafford, Ellettsville Town Council

LG009-01 **Comment:**

1/2/2013 E-mail transmittal (Coppock)
Attached is a comment letter from the Town of Ellettsville.

1/2/2013 letter
Re: I-69 Preliminary Alternatives

As a participating agency on the Indiana Department of Transportation's I-69 Section 5 project the Town of Ellettsville would like to add the following comments;

In summary the Town supports the Preferred Alternate No.8 of the DEIS as follows;

Ellettsville prefers Option A at North Walnut Street as this would provide access for the traffic movements generated from the areas in and around the Town of Ellettsville. This is necessary to maintain traffic flow from the Ellettsville area and developments north of Ellettsville and also to access Blucher Pool, a City of Bloomington Utilities maintained sewage treatment plant and provide safe and adequate access to the interchange. If this cannot be accomplished, Option B is supported provided a road is constructed that connects Bottom Road and the Sample Road interchange by Monroe County with assistance from INDOT.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-46 response regarding Walnut Interchange and LG001-03 response regarding connections from Sample Road interchange.

LG009-02 **Comment:**

Summary of North Walnut Street Interchange Proposals;

Option A- Full Access Interchange

Option A provides full access to Bottom Road, a concern for Ellettsville and Monroe County. Bottom Road serves the Ellettsville community and the developments surrounding it. It further serves as the main access to the City of Bloomington's Blucher Pool, a sewage treatment facility. This option would provide the best access to the traveling public in this area however it may create additional environmental concerns.



Option B- Use of the Existing Partial Interchange

Option B utilizes the existing partial interchange with no changes or access to the west. This will be an issue for those that currently utilize Bottom Road since it will not have connectivity to the interchange. It also lessens environmental impacts and financial impacts to the project.

Sample Road Interchange

Sample Road will remain open to traffic as proposed in the DEIS with the construction of a single folded interchange. The road segment will realize an increase in traffic due to the closure of access from the interstate at Bottom Road and Simpson Chapel Road. As stated previously for the North Walnut Street partial interchange (Option B), it will be necessary to improve Sample Road from Bottom Road to Old State Road 37 in order to;

- 1) Provide adequate east / west traffic flow and interstate access from Ellettsville area and northwest Monroe County.
- 2) Address concerns with access to the City of Bloomington Utilities Blucher Pool on Bottom Road for septic haulers and for delivery of supplies to the wastewater treatment plant.
- 3) Most of the planned high density residential development will occur in the Ellettsville Rural Community area and the area around the planned interchange at Sample Road. Thus, both areas will need adequate access to the interstate to accommodate future growth in this part of the County.

Recommendations:

- 1) Support Option A or Option B with a Sample Road Interchange subject to;
 - a) A single folded diamond interchange is proposed at this location, with the travel lanes to accommodate anticipated future traffic.
 - b) improvements for Sample Road, east to Old State Road 37 and west to Bottom Road, from the interstate, inclusive of alternative transportation improvements.

Feel free to contact me at your convenience if you would like to discuss these issues in more detail.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-46 response regarding Walnut Interchange and LG001-03 response regarding connections from Sample Road interchange.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

LG010 **1/2/2013 E-mail (Baker)/Letter/Report**
Iris Kiesling, Vice President, Monroe County Board of Commissioners
Provided by 1/2/2013 E-mail from Bill Williams, Monroe County Public Works Director
/ Highway Engineer Monroe County Highway Department

LG010-01 **Comment:**

Please find comments regarding to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement from the Monroe County Board of Commissioners for Section 5 of the I-69 project. A hard copy of this is being mailed to you as well. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or comments. Thank you for your assistance,

[1/2/2013 letter]

Please find attached a report prepared by the Monroe County Highway Department for the Monroe County Commissioners as it relates to the impacts of I-69 in our County. Be advised that we have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Section 5, have discussed the latest alignments, potential road closures and impacts of the project with Bill Williams, Monroe County Public Works Director / Highway Engineer, in detail, and concur with the requirements, concerns and recommendations that are listed in the report.

Therefore, consider the attached report the formal comments from the Monroe County Board of Commissioners on the DEIS for Section 5 of the I-69 project. We urge the Indiana Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration to favorably consider the information outlined in this report.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact us at your convenience.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-01 response. Responses to specific comments follow.

LG010-02 **Comment:**

Enclosed Report:

I-69 Monroe County Road Impacts of Section 5 Comments for Tier 2, Draft Environmental Impact Statement January 2, 2013

Prepared for: The Monroe County Board of Commissioners by:
Bill Williams Monroe County Highway Engineer January 2, 2013

Introduction

This report was prepared to use as a directive for the review of the impacts the construction of I-69, Section 5, will have on the road system of the Monroe County Highway Department. Unlike this Department's review of Tier 1 and the 2005 review of

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

Tier 2, which reviewed all roads in the entire 2 mile wide Study Band and, in some instances, discussed possible affects on the road network outside of that study boundary, this report will focus on specific access issues to the interstate and the proposed grade separations and/or closures being proposed at this time and the impact on the local transportation network, both vehicular and alternative, caused by these various alternatives. It will also address other environmental issues such as drainage and noise, as well as construction concerns and phasing of the project.

The report focuses on Section 5, from the State Road 37, south of Bloomington in Monroe County to State Road 39 in Morgan County, with information provided to this office by the Indiana Department of Transportation and their consultant, Michael Baker Corporation, specifically documents and maps titled "I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Section 5: Bloomington to Martinsville", dated October, 2012.

Response:

Comment noted. Responses to specific comments follow.

LG010-03**Comment:**

As with most projects of this magnitude, it is anticipated that additional comments by the Monroe County Commissioners and Monroe County Drainage Board will be afforded as the detailed plans are developed once a Record of Decision has been made and approved by the Federal Highway Administration. This is in accordance with current Federal Highway Administration rules and regulations. We further anticipate being able to review and comment on the drainage impacts on our existing roadway drainage ditches and structures that a refined alignment will provide, thus the ability to review the impacts in accord with Monroe County Code Chapter 761, Monroe County's Storm Water Management Ordinance, shall be required.

Response:

While there will be continued involvement with the county throughout the design process, INDOT, as an MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permittee, is not required to comply with requirements of other MS4 permittees. INDOT will continue discussions with Monroe County officials regarding water protection features which are incorporated into I-69 final design and plans can be obtained for review following various stages of design. The Monroe County Engineer will have the opportunity to disseminate the plans to the Monroe County Commissioners, Drainage Board, Highway Department, Planning Department, or other county agencies. However, this coordination will not require approval or sign-off of design plans by Monroe County nor compliance to Monroe County Code Chapter 761, Monroe County's Storm Water Management Ordinance as the I-69 project is to comply with state and federal requirements but is not required to meet local ordinances. INDOT will satisfy the conditions of the Karst MOU and all applicable permits.



LG010-04 Comment:

Given the possibility of a design-build contract for Section 5, as has been done in segments of previous Sections, versus the design-bid-build, which affords additional comments during the design period, timely coordination and review is necessary by all parties if the design-build process is used. Monroe County Government agencies, such as the Highway Department and Planning Department, request to be advised of the design as it is developed. This is necessary for coordination with emergency agencies, schools and other public and private agencies.

Response:

Continual involvement with the county will be afforded throughout the design process and plans can be obtained for review following various stages of design, as discussed further in LG010-24 response. .

LG010-05 Comment:

As was stated in previous the Tier I and Tier 2 submittals by this Department and the Monroe County Board of Commissioners, we expect the Federal Highway Administration and the Indiana Department of Transportation to fund and construct frontage roads, grade separations and interchanges at critical locations in order to maintain a high degree of safety for the public and our emergency response personnel. Previous Tier 1 and Tier 2 studies indicated that the County transportation network would be restricted along the Section 5 corridor. This includes building new frontage roads to connect to substandard roadways that currently have lower traffic volumes than that expected once the connections to the interstate are closed. Given Monroe County is a County that is continuing to develop at a rapid pace, improvements to the local road system should be considered when development of the interstate occurs. This will require further study, assurance and commitment of additional State or Federal funding support, as well as coordination as construction plans are developed.

Response:

As the existing facility is upgraded to interstate standards, traffic will only be able to access I-69 via interchanges. In the rural portion of the project, the Refined Preferred Alternative provides for local access roads to serve existing local roads which intersect existing SR 37, as well as individual residential and commercial properties with existing driveway connections to SR 37. In most cases, these local access roads are constructed adjacent to I-69. In some cases, the local access roads will make use of existing local infrastructure. No improvements to the existing local road network are planned as part of the Refined Preferred Alternative.



LG010-06 Comment:

Monroe County actively participated in the "I-69 Community Planning Program" and submitted a report to the INDOT which was found acceptable and approved by the Division of Planning. Recommendations for improvements as it relates to the INDOT's implementation of this project were detailed in said report and incorporated as a part of Monroe County's formal comment as it applies to Section 5 of this project. The report was unanimously recommended for approval by the Monroe County Plan Commission on July 20, 2010, and was formally adopted by the Monroe County Board of Commissioners on August 27, 2010 via Resolution 2010-20.

Response:

FHWA and INDOT are cognizant of the recommendations of these and other plans, and seek to incorporate their findings as is reasonable and feasible in developing the interstate highway facility. Please refer to LG007-19 response. Discussions will continue with Monroe County in regards to design features within the County's jurisdiction during final design.

LG010-07 Comment:

There are seven preferred interchange options in Section 5 between State Road 37 and State Road 39, inclusive of these locations, of which the preferred alternates are generally consistent with previous County recommendations. Additionally, however, for the safety of the traveling public that use this interstate, emergency access points should be provided for ambulance, fire and police agencies given their need to provide their services on this State-owned facility if deemed necessary by the emergency agencies in this community.

Response:

Within the limits of the Section 5 project, there are seven interchanges included within the Refined Preferred Alternative (not including the SR 37 interchange within the limits of Section 4). One of the interchanges provides for access at both Tapp Road and SR 45/2nd Street (via a split diamond interchange). One of the seven interchanges (Liberty Church interchange) falls within Morgan County. The number of access points provided within Monroe County is high in comparison to communities of similar size adjacent to an interstate in other parts of the state. While emergency crossovers are planned (see LG006-03 response), no additional emergency access points are under consideration in the Refined Preferred Alternative.

LG010-08 Comment:

As mentioned in the preferred alternate, grade separations were proposed at Rockport Road, Vernal Pike / 17th Street, Arlington Road, Kinser Pike, and Chambers Pike. These grade separations, along with the interchanges, will assist with intercounty and



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

interstate traffic movements in Monroe County provided that adequate access / frontage roads are constructed.

Response:

Comment noted. Local access roads are being constructed.

LG010-09

Comment:

Local access roads are proposed, that will serve as frontage roads, along existing State Road 37 being converted to I-69, beginning at the North Walnut Street interchange to near the Monroe / Morgan County line. On the east side of the interchange, a frontage road beginning at Walnut Street and end at Chambers Pike, which will accommodate existing residents and businesses in this area. Most of the access road will utilize the existing SR 37 northbound lane, as new southbound I-69 lanes will be constructed west of the existing southbound lane in this segment. Also, a local access road / frontage road is proposed on the west side of the interstate from Charlie Taylor Road to Burma Road which again will aid in providing access to the existing residents and businesses. Unfortunately, some of the access road / frontage roads are being connected to existing roads that have severe horizontal and vertical alignment problems. Also, the existing pavement cross-section in these areas are of insufficient depth to carry the type and volumes of traffic anticipated.

Response:

The Refined Preferred Alternative 8 continues to re-use segments of the existing local road network. INDOT is continuing coordination with Monroe County to identify ways to improve local connectivity west of I-69 at Sample Road interchange under a separate local project. Travel patterns, local public road connectivity, and traffic forecasts for select local roads such as Walnut Street and Chambers Pike are discussed in Section 5.6, *Traffic Impacts*.

LG010-10

Comment:

We recommend that INDOT reconstruct these road segments in coordination with the reconstruction of the interstate in order to provide a safe and efficient road system in the area. Otherwise, if left unimproved, the costs for upgrading must be borne by Monroe County. The INDOT and FHWA should commit to supplemental financial assistance to fund the improvements necessary by their restrictions to and across State Road 37 and the consequent increased demand for the use of County roads, inadequate for the new traffic demand.

Response:

Please see response to LG010-09 regarding coordination going forward with local agencies on local access issues.

**LG010-11 Comment:**

Aesthetic interchange and grade separation treatments are desired in this community. There exist several options that INDOT is familiar with such as form liners for abutment walls, piers and bridge railing to stamped and/or colored concrete for the same. Areas of native grasses or wildflower plantings could be added to enhance the interchanges and grade separations. The Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce has formed a committee, consisting local government officials and private interests that is investigating the various options and recommend the INDOT work with this group to select a common theme throughout the corridor.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-13 response.

LG010-12 Comment:

Another aesthetic matter is the protection of our historic resources. Some of the locations as designated in the DEIS are adjacent to or near the interstate corridor. The Monroe County Historic Preservation Board has reviewed the corridor and offered comments as it relates to historic locations along the corridor. A relatively cost effective treatment may be to protect these areas with existing limestone blocks which could also be used for noise abatement purposes. Some of the comments from the MCHPB are listed in DEIS, Appendix N, Sub appendix F, for reference.

Response:

Please refer to LG002-01 response regarding general issue of impacts to cultural resources. The documentation referenced in FEIS Appendix N includes mitigation measures as described in the Section 106 MOA for the Section 5 project.

LG010-13 Comment:

As it relates to Alternative Transportation issues in Section 5, we are referencing the "*Monroe County Alternative Transportation and Greenways Plan*", adopted by the Monroe County Board of Commissioners on May 26, 2006, for direction, which provides guidance for recommendations on improvements adjacent to and along Section 5. On most of the County maintained areas it is recommended that on-road opportunities, or paved shoulders, be provided to satisfy this requirement. The exceptions are the Fullerton Pike area where the County has a major roadway improvement project with a planned 10 foot wide, separated multi-use facility that links three City owned trails and at Vernal Pike where the County has constructed an 8 foot wide multi-use trail along a recently completed road project, both of which should be carried across the interstate to accommodate bike and pedestrian traffic movements. Also, the "*I-69/SR 37 Alternative Transportation Corridor Study*" helps to provide the focus for improvements along the overpasses and interchanges and should be used for guidance when considering bridge and road widths.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Response:

Please refer to LG010-23 and LG007-07 responses regarding alternative transportation provisions at Fullerton Pike and Vernal Pike/17th Street, respectively.

LG010-14 Comment:

Another concern is the area wildlife. Since the subsections at the south and north of Section 5 are rural in nature, continued review and implementation of the placement of wildlife corridors is strongly urged. This is a matter of public safety given the possibility of a crash involving an animal and vehicle is high in these areas.

Response:

Please refer to AF003-04 response.

LG010-15 Comment:

It is believed that the Participating Agency meetings were successful in that it allowed communities to express concerns and needs as the DEIS was developed. It is strongly encouraged to continue this communication by allowing any interested governmental agency to participate in the Design Team Meetings. This was allowed in Section 4 and we believe it was very useful to both the INDOT and Monroe County during this phase of the project's development.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-01 response. Affected governmental agencies will be invited to continue their participation in this project through the design phase of the Section 5 project.

LG010-16 Comment:

This report will comment only on those Subsections in Monroe County, and those in Morgan County that will have an impact on the Monroe County road system. Comments will be further refined to the preferred alternates in those subsections.

This report was submitted on behalf of the Monroe County Board of Commissioners. Comments regarding this report should be directed to Bill Williams, Monroe County Public Works Director / Highway Engineer, Courthouse, Room 323, Bloomington, Indiana, 47404, by calling (812) 349-2555, or by e-mail at bwilliams@co.monroe.in.us.

Response:

Comment noted. Responses to specific comments follow.

**LG010-17** **Comment:****GENERAL COMMENTS for SUBSECTION 5A**SR 37/I-69 & That Road to north of Fullerton Pike

1. **TRAFFIC STUDIES & GRADE SEPARATIONS** - After a review of Appendix GG, the "*I-69 Corridor Model Documentation: Technical Memorandum: Interim Traffic Forecasting Models for I-69 Section 5 DEIS*", dated October, 2012, it was found that traffic modeling was conducted on this Section using the latest in available data in order to prepare the 2035 traffic forecast. While a Level of Service (LOS) analysis reviews congestion due to increases in traffic, it does not take into account substandard roadway geometry and cross-sections which will be impacted by the increased vehicles using said roadways. Increased traffic directed to substandard roads is not acceptable and should be addressed with this project for safety of the traveling public. Roadways, where permanently detoured traffic is to travel, should be assessed and improvements shall be made in accordance with the current Indiana Design Manual for the roads that are impacted which do not meet the IDM's criteria for the functional classification of the impacted road. An example in this subsection is the closure of Judd Avenue at Fullerton Pike which will require residential traffic to access Fullerton Pike via Sharon Drive or Sims Lane, both internal subdivision streets. A benefit/cost analysis of the possible road closures were not analyzed in this Subsection however, this example will not need to be reviewed due to the short detour length.

Response:

Section 5.3.4 of the FEIS, *Travel Patterns and Accessibility*, discusses efforts made to address community impacts, including local access issues. A variety of means were used to assess which local roads were to remain open. These include various public outreach efforts, a staffed project office, small-group meetings, Public Information Meetings, business/EMS/church surveys, a project website, field inventories, and comments from concerned property owners. This input was used to identify the importance of individual roads and to determine whether they would remain open or would be terminated. Issues considered included public safety (police and fire service), school bus operations, non-motorized travel, and farming operations. FHWA/INDOT interchange spacing guidelines, traffic volumes, and density of roadway network and overall project costs were also taken into consideration in determining access changes.

Input from emergency responders, local highway departments, and county commissioners are detailed the FEIS Section 5.3.5, *Community Facilities and Services*, and Section 11.3, *Public and Community Outreach* in the FEIS. Many local access roads are provided as part of the Refined Preferred Alternative to maintain connectivity proximate to I-69. Reconstruction of local road segments within the construction footprint identified in this FEIS will comply with the Indiana Design Manual and cul-de-sacs that accommodate a vehicle with a 50-foot wheel base will be constructed at all road closure locations. (Please refer to LG010-18 regarding Judd Avenue). Local road upgrades for minor traffic volume changes due to road closures are not incorporated into the Refined Preferred Alternative.



LG010-18 Comment:

In summary, we support the following all as stated in the DEIS for Preferred Alternate No. 8;

- a. closure of That Road on the west side of the interchange, provided a cul-de-sac is constructed and the road reconstructed in accordance with the IDM on the east side of the interstate to connect with Rockport Road. The east side road relocation shall allow for an on-street bike lane adjacent to the roadway in accordance with Monroe County's Alternative Transportation and Greenways Plan;
- b. construction of a grade separation at Rockport Road with bridge and road widths that satisfy both traffic and alternative transportation needs as mentioned above;
- c. the closure of Judd Avenue, subject to the construction of a cul-de-sac at the point of closure;
- d. the double folded diamond as proposed at Fullerton Pike, with the travel lanes to accommodate anticipated improvements to Fullerton Pike, east to Rockport Road and west of the Medical Suites Building, from the interstate, inclusive of alternative transportation improvements,
- e. all pavement markings in the State Right-of-Way shall be the responsibility of the INDOT to maintain

Response:

All of the above requests are included in the Refined Preferred Alternative with the exception of the request for the cul-de-sac at Judd Avenue. The Refined Preferred Alternative recommends the removal of the pavement on existing Judd Avenue from Fullerton Pike to Jordan Road. There is no need for a cul-de-sac since access is served to all remaining properties off of Judd Avenue. Also, a cul-de-sac is not needed for a turnaround because the pavement will be removed.

LG010-19 Comment:

INDOT should include in the work in this area the following;

- a. reconstruction of the portion of Rockport Road, from the southern terminus of the overpass at the interstate to Fullerton Pike, in order to improve the vertical alignment and the cross-section of the road segment that will serve traffic traveling from That Road to the Fullerton Pike interchange and visa versa. Accommodations for alternative transportation needs shall be satisfied in this road segment.
- b. INDOT should also construct a cul-de-sac at the proposed dead end of Judd Avenue or design and construct a curve that ties Judd Avenue into Jordan Court.

Response:

Rockport Road will be reconstructed within the limits requested. Please refer to LG010-18 response in regards to Judd Avenue.



LG010-20 Comment:

2. KARST - This area has Karst features that require avoidance and protection during construction. Erosion control measures shall be adhered to in order to protect these features. Recommend that Monroe County Code Chapters 761, Storm Water Management, and 829, Karst and Sinkhole Development Standards, be applied.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-03 response.

LG010-21 Comment:

3. DRAINAGE - Impacts to the all bridges and drainage structures shall be evaluated for construction impacts during the design phase with a review by the Monroe County Highway Department. All hydraulic studies and information regarding storm water runoff impacts shall be available for review and comment as the detailed design plans are prepared in accordance with Monroe County Code 761, the Storm Water Management Ordinance. This is needed in order to assess the capabilities of downstream structures to adequately handle increased runoff from this facility.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-03 response.

LG010-22 Comment:

4. EMERGENCY SERVICES - Emergency response time will be hindered by closures in this subsection. Further discussion with the Monroe County Sheriffs Department, Emergency Management Department and fire departments that serve this area, Perry-Clear Creek and Van Buren Fire Departments should be conducted to assure their response times are adequate to serve the public need.

Response:

These discussions will continue, as requested.

LG010-23 Comment:

5. ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION - Alternative modes of transportation should be considered along this segment. Many bicyclists utilize the road network in this area of Monroe County of which accommodations should be reviewed and constructed with grade separations. Compliance and application of the INDOT's Context Sensitive Solutions policies, which can further incorporate Bloomington Monroe County MPO's Complete Street Policy, adopted January 9, 2009, and Monroe County's Alternative Transportation and Greenways Plan, adopted by the Board of Commissioners via Resolution 2006-08, should be adhered to. This includes paved shoulders on the



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

realigned and reconstructed portion of That Road (east side) and Rockport Road. Monroe County has plans to construct a 5 foot sidewalk, with a grass setback from the curb, along the south side of Fullerton Pike and a 10 foot bike trail / multiuse path along the north side of this road as part of the County's Fullerton Pike Corridor Improvement Project, beginning at Rockport Road. Therefore, this cross-section should be carried through the construction limits.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-21 response regarding general issue of incorporation of other local plans. The paved shoulders are provided as part of the Refined Preferred Alternative, on the reconstructed portions of That Road and Rockport Road. The Refined Preferred Alternative includes sidewalk and multi-use path as requested on Fullerton Pike.

LG010-24

Comment:

6. CONSTRUCTION - Construction plans and phasing shall be reviewed and approved by Monroe County Highway Department with input from the Monroe County Sheriff Department and other emergency response agencies. Coordination of construction related activities shall be provided until completed. Routing of construction materials shall be reviewed and approved by Monroe County to assure weight limits and loadings are adhered to.

Response:

Continual involvement with the county will be afforded throughout the design process and plans can be obtained for review following various stages of design. The Monroe County Engineer will have the opportunity to disseminate the plans to the Monroe County Sheriff Department and other emergency response agencies. However, this coordination will not require approval or sign-off of construction plans by Monroe County. In accordance with the INDOT Standard Specifications, any contractor that is awarded a contract within Section 5 will be responsible for coordinating with the County regarding schedule, road closures, material haul routes, etc. and the contractor shall adhere to county weight limits and loadings during construction.

LG010-25

Comment:

7. THOROUGHFARE PLANS - The Monroe County Thoroughfare Plan, adopted via Monroe County Ordinance 95-28, provides minimum standards for our roadways and the Functional Classification of each road segment. New construction of County Road segments shall comply with the Indiana Design Manual as it applies to each road segment that is reconstructed within the footprint of the I-69 environmental document. Furthermore, if it is decided to close a road segment, cul-de-sacs shall be constructed at those locations that will provide for a vehicle wheel base of 50 feet to turn around. This is necessary for emergency vehicles, highway maintenance vehicles, school busses and others that may need such an improvement. Also, the Bloomington-Monroe County



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan shall be reviewed for compliance for coordination of improvements.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-21 response regarding coordination with local plans. Please refer to LG006-02 response regarding design standards for road construction or reconstruction.

LG010-26 Comment:

8. SCHOOLS - With the closure of County Roads, additional impacts will be realized by the Monroe County Community School Corporation due to rerouting of busses in this area. Communication shall occur with the MCCSC Transportation Department in order to minimize the additional costs of a permanent detour.

Response:

The I-69 Section 5 Project Team appreciates feedback from Monroe County Community School Corporation (MCCSC) received in Section 5's Survey of Schools meeting (Appendix I), which occurred on August 1, 2012. During the meeting, MCCSC and the Section 5 Project Team collaborated over potential impacts related to road closures and school bus routing. At this meeting, the Project Team agreed to meet with MCCSC again to discuss rerouting that may occur for the 2013-2014 school season. A subsequent meeting was held on February 20, 2013 to review routes, access, time frames, and any specifications needed for design. Coordination with all local governments, including MCCSC and RBBCSC, will be maintained during the final design and construction phase of the project.

LG010-27 Comment:

9. NOISE ANALYSIS - This area is rural to suburban in nature. Continued investigation of the installation of noise walls shall be conducted in the area at the northwest corner of Fullerton Pike and the interstate due to the density of the residential area.

Response:

The preliminary analysis results for this area indicate that a noise barrier is both reasonable and feasible on the west side of I-69 between Fullerton Pike and Tapp Rd. Surveys concerning the preliminary barrier study have been sent to the potentially affected residents in this area to solicit their opinions and desire for noise abatement. The noise analysis report has been updated for the FEIS (see Appendix W).

LG010-28 Comment:

10. AESTHETICS - Aesthetic interchange and grade separation treatments are desired in this community. There exist several options that INDOT is familiar with such as form



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

liners for abutment walls, piers and bridge railing to stamped and/or colored concrete for the same. Areas of native grasses or wildflower plantings could be added to enhance the interchanges and grade separations. The Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce has formed a committee, consisting local government officials and private interests that is investigating the various options and recommend the INDOT work with this group to select a common theme throughout the corridor.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-13 response.

LG010-28A Comment:

COUNTY ROAD NAME	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	ADT ROAD WIDTH & SURFACE	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS
That Road	West side – closed with cul-de-sac East side – relocated to Rockport Road	Major Collector	West side 725 22 feet Bituminous surface East side 3,600 24 feet Bituminous surface w/ paved shoulder	A permanent closure is proposed on the west side and a new roadway reconstructed with connection made to Rockport Road on the east side of I-69. Therefore, concur with the construction of a frontage road to tie into Rockport Road, as proposed. Recommendations; 1) Support closing the intersection provided efforts are made to keep this intersection open until frontage road is constructed on east side of interstate as proposed. 2) West side improvements; a) Construct a cul-de-sac at the east end of That Road for a minimum of WB-50 to use. 3) Accommodations for bicycles shall be made per Monroe County Alternative Transportation Plan (on-road, 5' striped, paved shoulders).
Rockport Road	Grade Separation	Major Collector	890 20 feet Bituminous surface	Road will be closed to interstate access. Road will remain open to traffic as proposed in the DEIS with the construction of an overpass. The road segment will realize increase in traffic due to closure of That Road. Recommendations: 1) Support Grade Separation.



				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Rockport Road shall be widened from south of the overpass to Fullerton Pike, inclusive of vertical improvements in this segment. 3) Accommodations for bicycles shall be made per Monroe County Alternative Transportation Plan (on-road, 5' striped, paved shoulders)
Fullerton Pike Fullerton Pike (continued)	Interchange (double-folded)	Principal Arterial	<p>West side 5,257 18 feet w/ turn lane at SR 37 Bituminous surface</p> <p>East side 1,602 18 feet Bituminous surface</p>	<p>Road will remain open to traffic as proposed in the DEIS with the construction of an interchange. The road segment will realize increase in traffic due to the closure of access from the interstate at That Road and Rockport Road.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Support Interchange. 2) Given traffic projections in this area with I-69 and the Fullerton Pike project, multi-lanes are needed to accommodate traffic. Coordination of the projects has occurred between both agencies and shall continue. 3) Accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians shall be made per Monroe County Alternative Transportation Plan (off-road, 5' sidewalk on south side and a 10' multi-use trail on the north side). This could reduce the proposed cross-section of Fullerton Pike. 4) All markings within the Right-of-Way shall remain the responsibility of INDOT to maintain.
Judd Avenue	Closed	Local	No ADT data 18 feet Bituminous surface	<p>Road will be closed due to grades of Judd Avenue and that of west Fullerton Pike approach to interchange.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Support road closure subject to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Construct a cul-de-sac at the south end of Judd Avenue for a minimum of WB-50 to use; or; b) Reconstruct Judd Avenue with 30 mph curve to tie into Jordan Court.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Response:

Please refer to LG010-18 response regarding Judd Avenue. Additionally, the existing That Road intersection will remain open until connection to Rockport Road is constructed. However, the median crossover is being removed with Section 4 construction. At Fullerton Pike, accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians in the Refined Preferred Alternative include 5' sidewalk with a 5' buffer on south side and a 10' multi-use trail on the north side.

LG010-28B Comment:

East Lane	No construction proposed.	Local	77 11 feet Bituminous surface	This road will not be closed or directly impacted with construction. Recommendations: Construction traffic shall not use this road as the roadbed is not sufficient for these loads and the road width is insufficient and would create a traffic safety hazard.
Stansifer Lane	No construction proposed.	Local	50 17 feet Bituminous surface	This road will not be closed or directly impacted with construction. Recommendations: Construction traffic shall not use this road as the roadbed is not sufficient for these loads and the road width is insufficient and would create a traffic safety hazard.
W. Leonard Springs Road	No construction proposed.	Major Collector	2,000 13 feet Chip & Seal	This road segment will not be closed or directly impacted with construction. Recommendations: Construction traffic shall not use this road as the roadbed is not sufficient for these loads and the road width is insufficient and would create a traffic safety hazard. NOTE: S. Leonard Springs Road will realize an increase in traffic per the ISTDM's latest version. Consideration should be made to improving the segment between Tapp Road and SR 45, a City maintained street.
W. Leonard Springs Road (continued)				
That Road, west of Rockport Road	No construction proposed.	Local	650 19 feet Bituminous surface	This road will not be closed or directly impacted with construction. Recommendations: Construction traffic shall not use this road as the roadbed is not sufficient for these loads and the road width is insufficient and would create a traffic safety hazard.



Response:

INDOT will coordinate with local officials during design and construction to appropriately address construction traffic on local roads and construction access to the right-of-way. Please refer to LG007-08 regarding consideration of local projects such as W. Leonard Springs Road.

LG010-29

Comment:

GENERAL COMMENTS for SUBSECTION 5B
North of Fullerton Pike to north of Vernal Pike

1. TRAFFIC STUDIES. INTERCHANGES & GRADE SEPARATIONS - After a review of Appendix GG, the "I-69 Corridor Model Documentation: Technical Memorandum: Interim Traffic Forecasting Models for I-69 Section 5 DEIS", dated October, 2012, it was found that traffic modeling was conducted on this Section using the latest in available data in order to prepare the 2035 traffic forecast. While a Level of Service (LOS) analysis reviews congestion due to increases in traffic, it does not take into account substandard roadway geometry and cross-sections which will be impacted by the increased vehicles using said roadways. Increased traffic directed to substandard roads is not acceptable and should be addressed with this project for safety of the traveling public. Roadways, where permanently detoured traffic is to travel, should be assessed and improvements shall be made in accordance with the current Indiana Design Manual for the roads that are impacted which do not meet the IDM's criteria for the functional classification of the impacted road.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-17 response.

LG010-30

Comment:

In summary, we support Preferred Alternate No.8 of the DEIS as follows;

- a. the construction of a split diamond interchange to accommodate traffic movements to and from Tapp Road and State Road 45 / 2nd Street, provided improvements include bike and pedestrians accommodations planned by the City of Bloomington and Monroe County at both locations;
- b. use of the existing State Road 45 / 2nd Street interchange bridge subject to approval by the City of Bloomington for use of a portion of their property at Wapahani Park and bike and pedestrian accommodations being made at the interchange;
- c. closure of Barger Lane, with connection to Maple Leaf Drive, and Yonkers Drive at Tapp Road, due to the approach grade of Tapp Road over the interstate. NOTE: Monroe County only maintains 265 feet of Barger Lane, north of Tapp Road. Monroe County would have to vacate this road segment as it is not contiguous with another public roadway if it severed from Tapp Road;



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

- d. find the design exception for shoulder width at the Indiana Rail Road Co. bridge satisfactory;
- e. use of the existing State Road 48 / W. 3rd Street interchange subject to bike and pedestrian accommodations are made connecting to the existing facilities in the SR 48 / 3rd Street corridor;
- f. concur with the overpass of Vernal Pike subject to
 - i. continuing the existing cross-section on a recently completed portion of Vernal Pike, west of the interstate;
 - ii. reduce the grade on the west approach to 5%, where possible, to accommodate truck traffic in the area and
 - iii. work with the City of Bloomington to continue said cross-section east to connect to a planned roundabout project to improve the corridor.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-02 response regarding Tapp Road bicycle/pedestrian treatment and related access issues (points a. and c.); response LG007-04 response regarding Wapehani Mountain Bike Park; response LG007-03 regarding 2nd Street bicycle/pedestrian treatment; response LG007-06 regarding 3rd Street bicycle/pedestrian treatment; and LG007-07 response regarding Vernal Pike design issues. Coordination on Vernal Pike issues will continue with Monroe County and City of Bloomington.

The Refined Preferred Alternative 8 does not include additional work between Gates Drive and Vernal Pike beyond the limits of the I-69 project. The connection requested is in the BMCMPPO 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan with a \$10M construction cost and would be beyond the I-69 project study area. INDOT is discussing participation with the County on the requested improvements as a local project but it would be conducted as a separate project from I-69.

LG010-31 Comment:

INDOT should include the following improvements in this Subsection;

- a. Construction of a bike / pedestrian bridge between SR 45 / 2nd and SR 48 / 3rd Street to provide for these types of safe movements across the interstate. Said bridge would connect Liberty Drive to Basswood Drive, south of the Indiana Rail Road bridge (See letter from Monroe County Board of Commissioners, dated 7/27/2012, in DEIS, Appendix P).
- b. Construction of a railroad bridge over the CSX Railroad connecting Industrial Drive and Gates Drive to provide and improve traffic movements to the Whitehall Crossing area. This will assist with reduction in traffic, improving the Level of Service, at the State Road 48 / I-69 interchange that are attempting to reach this destination.



Response:

Please refer to LG007-05 response regarding a bike / pedestrian bridge between 2nd and 3rd Streets. Please refer to PI099-01 response regarding the connection of Industrial Park Drive and Gates Drive, which is a local project already included in the Bloomington-Monroe County MPO's Long Range Plan.

LG010-32 Comment:

2. KARST - This area has Karst features that require avoidance and protection during construction. Erosion control measures shall be adhered to in order to protect these features. Recommend that Monroe County Code Chapters 761, Storm Water Management, and 829, Karst and Sinkhole Development Standards, be applied.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-03 response.

LG010-33 Comment:

3. DRAINAGE- Impacts to the all bridges and drainage structures shall be evaluated for construction impacts during the design phase with a review by the Monroe County Highway Department. All hydraulic studies and information regarding storm water runoff impacts shall be available for review and comment as the detailed design plans are prepared in accordance with Monroe County Code 761, the Storm Water Management Ordinance. This is needed in order to assess the capabilities of downstream structures to adequately handle increased runoff from this facility.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-03 response.

LG010-34 Comment:

4. EMERGENCY SERVICES - Emergency response time will be hindered by closures in this subsection. Further discussion with the Sheriffs Department, Emergency Management Department, and fire departments that serve this area, Bloomington, Richland, Perry-Clear Creek and Van Buren Fire Departments should be conducted to assure their response times are adequate to serve the public need.

Response:

Please refer to LG001-02 response.



LG010-35 **Comment:**

5. ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION - Alternative modes of transportation should be considered along this segment. Many bicyclists utilize the road network in this area of Monroe County of which accommodations should be reviewed and constructed with grade separations. Compliance and application of the INDOT's Context Sensitive Solutions policies, which can further incorporate Bloomington Monroe County MPO's Complete Street Policy, adopted January 9, 2009, and Monroe County's Alternative Transportation and Green ways Plan, adopted by the Board of Commissioners via Resolution 2006-08 should be adhered to.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-21 response regarding general issue of incorporation of other local plans.

LG010-36 **Comment:**

6. CONSTRUCTION - Construction plans and phasing shall be reviewed and approved by Monroe County Highway Department with input from the Monroe County Sheriff Department and other emergency response agencies. Coordination of construction related activities shall be provided until completed. Routing of construction materials shall be reviewed and approved by Monroe County to assure weight limits and loadings are adhered to. Blasting should be coordinated with area limestone quarries in this area to prevent damages to mineral deposits at or near this subsection.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-24 response.

LG010-37 **Comment:**

7. THOROUGHFARE PLANS - The Monroe County Thoroughfare Plan, adopted via Monroe County Ordinance 95-28, provides minimum standards for our roadways and the Functional Classification of each road segment. New construction of County Road segments shall comply with the INDOT Road Design Manual as it applies to each road segment that is reconstructed within the footprint of the I-69 environmental document. Furthermore, if it is decided to close a road segment, cul-de-sacs shall be constructed at those locations that will provide for a vehicle wheel base of 50 feet to turn around. This is necessary for emergency vehicles, highway maintenance vehicles, school busses and others that may need such an improvement. Also, the Bloomington-Monroe County MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan shall be reviewed for compliance for coordination of improvements.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-21 and LG006-02 responses.



LG010-38 Comment:

8. SCHOOLS - With the closure of County Roads, additional impacts will be realized by the Monroe County Community School Corporation and Richland Bean Blossom Community School Corporation due to rerouting of busses in this area. Vernal Pike has busses from both MCCSC and RBBCSC schools. Communication shall occur with the MCCSC Transportation Department in order to minimize the additional costs of a permanent detour.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-26 response.

LG010-39 Comment:

9. NOISE ANALYSIS - This area is suburban to urban in nature. Landscaping or noise barriers should be provided for minimizing noise impacts to this area.

Response:

The Highway Traffic Noise Analysis was performed in accordance with the Indiana Department of Transportation *Highway Traffic Analysis Procedure*. The analysis provided a comprehensive description and evaluation of the existing noise levels, the design year 2035 No-Build noise levels, and the design year 2035 noise levels for the Build Alternatives, as well as a detailed Highway Noise Mitigation Assessment for the design year 2035 traffic noise impacts for the Build Alternatives. Highway traffic noise abatement measures evaluated included traffic management measures, alteration of horizontal and vertical alignments, acquisition of buffering land, noise insulation of public use or nonprofit institutional structures, and/or construction of traffic noise barriers. Highway Traffic Noise Mitigation will be provided in areas where the evaluated traffic noise abatement measures met the criteria to be considered both “reasonable” and “feasible”. Landscaping was not evaluated since FHWA does not consider landscaping as a viable noise abatement measure (“Highway Traffic Noise: Analysis and Abatement Guidance”, prepared by FHWA, dated June 2010). In this area, noise barriers were found to be reasonable and feasible on the west side of I-69 south of Tapp Rd., and on the east side of I-69 between Tapp Road and the Indiana Railroad Bridge. See FEIS Section 5.10, *Highway Noise*, for additional information.

LG010-40 Comment:

10. AESTHETICS - Aesthetic interchange and grade separation treatments are desired in this community. There exist several options that INDOT is familiar with such as form liners for abutment walls, piers and bridge railing to stamped and/or colored concrete for the same. Areas of native grasses or wildflower plantings could be added to enhance the interchanges and grade separations. The Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce has formed a committee, consisting local government officials and private



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

interests that is investigating the various options and recommend the INDOT work with this group to select a common theme throughout the corridor.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-13 response.

LG010-40A Comment:

COUNTY ROAD NAME	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	ADT ROAD WIDTH & SURFACE	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS
Tapp Road & State Road 45 / 2 nd Street	Split Diamond Interchange	Tapp Road Minor Arterial	<p><i>Tapp Road West of Interstate;</i> 6,209 24 feet Bituminous surface</p> <p>Tapp Road and 2nd Street, east of Interstate, owned by the City of Bloomington Bituminous surface</p>	<p>Roads will remain open to traffic as proposed in the DEIS with the construction of a split diamond interchange.</p> <p>Recommendations: 1) Support Interchange as proposed subject to; a) bike and pedestrians accommodations planned by the City of Bloomington and Monroe County at both Tapp Road and State Road 45 / 2nd Street the satisfy the City and County Alternative Transportation needs. At Tapp Road, Accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians shall be made per Monroe County Alternative Transportation Plan (off-road, 5' sidewalk on south side and a 10' multi-use trail on the north side).</p> <p>2) Support use of existing interchange bridge at SR 45 / 2nd Street subject to approval of use of land owned by the City of Bloomington at Wapahani Mountain Bike Park to allow for use of the existing State Road pavement.</p>
Barger Lane	Closed at Tapp Road	Local Road	ADT unknown 24 feet Bituminous surface	<p>Road will be closed due to grades of Barger Lane and that of the west approach of Tapp Road to interchange.</p> <p>Recommendations: 1) Support road closure subject to; Construction of a cul-de-sac at the south end of Barger Lane for a minimum of WB-50 to use and connection to Maple Leaf Drive at the</p>

I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement



				north end, as proposed in the DEIS. NOTE: <i>Monroe County does not maintain the northern segment of Barger Lane therefore County would be required to vacate the existing segment currently in the inventory as it would not be contiguous with a publicly maintained road as required by State law.</i>
Yonkers Drive Yonkers Drive (continued)	Closed at Tapp Road	Local Road	ADT unknown 10 feet Bituminous surface	Road will be closed due to grades of Yonkers Drive and that of west approach of Tapp Road to interchange. Recommendations: 1) Support road closure subject to; Construct a cul-de-sac at the north end of Yonkers Drive for a minimum of WB-50, as proposed in the DEIS.
State Road 48 / 3 rd Street	Interchange	Arterials	Owned by the INDOT on the west and the City of Bloomington on the east	Roads will remain open to traffic as proposed in the DEIS with the construction modifications to the existing interchange. Recommendations: 1) Support Interchange as proposed subject to; a) bike and pedestrians accommodations of the City of Bloomington at both 3 rd Street and State Road 48 to satisfy alternative transportation needs.
Vernal Pike	Overpass	Minor Arterial	West of Interstate 4,869 40 feet Bituminous surface East of Interstate owned by the City of Bloomington	Road will be closed to interstate access. Road will remain open to traffic as proposed in the DEIS with the construction of an overpass. Recommendations: 1) Support Grade Separation subject to; a) continuing the existing cross-section on a recently completed portion of Vernal Pike, west of the interstate; b) reduce the grade on the west approach to 5%, where possible, to accommodate truck traffic in the area; and c) coordinate improvement efforts with the City of Bloomington to continue said road improvements & cross-section east to connect to a planned roundabout project to improve the corridor. 2) Accommodations for bicycles



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

				<p>shall be made per Monroe County Alternative Transportation Plan (8' off-road, multi-use path on the north side, and sidewalk of 5' width on the south side)</p> <p>3) Suggest coordinating with the City of Bloomington regarding the construction of a cul-de-sac on the east side where existing Vernal Pike will terminate.</p>
Industrial Drive	Reconstructed / Relocated	Minor Arterial	1763 26 feet Bituminous surface	<p>The road connection with Vernal Pike will be relocated north of the existing intersection.</p> <p>Recommendations;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Support relocations subject to <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) that the grade shall be kept at a maximum of 5% to accommodate truck traffic generated from Industrial Drive. 2) Design of road satisfies IDM requirements for the functional classification. 3) Connection of Industrial Drive south to Gates Drive for better traffic distribution in the area as proposed in Tier 1, since Whitehall Crossing Boulevard will be closed. This would require a railroad bridge at this location.
Industrial Drive (continued)				
Hensonburg Road	Closed at Vernal Pike	Local	ADT Unknown 13 feet Bituminous surface	<p>Road will be closed due to grades of Barger Lane and that of the west approach of Vernal Pike overpass.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Support road closure subject to; Construction of a cul-de-sac at the north end of Hensonburg Road for a minimum of WB-50 to use. Also, must tie road into Industrial Drive for access.
Packingshouse Road	Reconstructed	Minor Arterial	ADT Unknown 18 feet Bituminous surface	<p>The road connection with Vernal Pike will be reconstructed near its existing location.</p> <p>Recommendations;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Support reconstruction as proposed subject to; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) That the grade shall be kept at a maximum of 5% to accommodate truck traffic generated from Industrial Drive. b) Design of road satisfy IDM requirements for the functional classification



Response:

Please refer to LG007-02 response regarding Tapp Rd. bicycle/pedestrian treatment and changes proposed for the Barger Lane access. Additionally, the abandoned pavement sections of Barger Lane and Yonkers will be removed and curb constructed along Tapp Road. Please refer to LG007-04 response regarding Wapehani Mountain Bike Park; LG007-03 response regarding 2nd Street bicycle/pedestrian treatment; and LG007-06 response regarding 3rd Street bicycle/pedestrian treatment. Refer to LG007-07 response regarding Vernal Pike design issues. Coordination on Vernal Pike issues will continue with Monroe County and City of Bloomington. The existing functional classification of Industrial Drive is an Urban Local Street. Reconstruction of Industrial Drive will be designed to satisfy the IDM requirements for an Urban Local Street; the requested maximum grade of 5% will be observed. Please refer to PI099-01 response regarding the connection of Industrial Park Drive and Gates Drive. This local project already is included in the BMCMPPO’s Long Range Plan. At Hensonburg Road, the requested cul-de-sac and access to Industrial Drive is included in the Refined Preferred Alternative. At Packinghouse Road, the existing functional classification is an Urban Local Street. The existing profile grade includes a segment of approximately 8%. Reconstruction of Packinghouse Road will be designed to satisfy the IDM requirements for an Urban Local Street; the requested maximum grade of 5% cannot be accommodated due to the grade raise of Vernal Pike/17th Street and the existing topography. IDM allows a maximum grade of 10% for this functional classification; the preliminary design utilizes 9%.

LG010-40B Comment:

S. Leonard Springs Road	No construction proposed.		Owned by the City of Bloomington	S. Leonard Springs Road will realize an increase in traffic per the ISTDM’s latest version below a satisfactory Level of Service. Consideration should be made to improving the segment between Tapp Road and SR 45, a City maintained street.
Curry Pike	No construction proposed.	Minor Arterial		Curry Pike will realize an increase in traffic and a decrease in the Level of Service but to an acceptable level given the existing lanes per the ISTDM.
Woodyard Road	No construction proposed.	Major Collector		This road segment will not be closed or directly impacted with construction. Recommendations: Construction traffic shall not use this road as the roadbed is not sufficient for construction loads. the road width is insufficient and would create a traffic safety hazard.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Crescent Road	No construction proposed.		Owned by the City of Bloomington	Due to truck traffic being directed to Crescent Road from businesses along Vernal Pike, east of the interstate, it is recommended the INDOT coordinate efforts with the City of Bloomington for improvements to this road segment.
---------------	---------------------------	--	----------------------------------	--

Response:

Please refer to LG010-28B response regarding construction impacts; LG007-08 response regarding consideration of local projects such as Leonard Springs Road; and LG007-07 response regarding Crescent Road. No improvements are proposed or required on Curry Pike, which was recently upgraded.

LG010-41

Comment:

GENERAL COMMENTS for SUBSECTION 5C
North of Vernal Pike to north of Kinser Pike

1. TRAFFIC STUDIES & GRADE SEPARATIONS - After a review of Appendix GG, the "I-69 Corridor Model Documentation: Technical Memorandum: Interim Traffic Forecasting Models for I-69 Section 5 DEIS", dated October, 2012, it was found that traffic modeling was conducted on this Section using the latest in available data in order to prepare the 2035 traffic forecast. While a Level of Service (LOS) analysis reviews congestion due to increases in traffic, it does not take into account substandard roadway geometry and cross-sections which will be impacted by the increased vehicles using said roadways. Increased traffic directed to substandard roads is not acceptable and should be addressed with this project for safety of the traveling public. Roadways, where permanently detoured traffic is to travel, should be assessed and improvements shall be made in accordance with the current Indiana Design Manual for the roads that are impacted which do not meet the IDM's criteria for the functional classification of the impacted road.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-17 response.

LG010-42

Comment:

In summary, we support Preferred Alternate No.8 of the DEIS as follows;

- a. use of the existing interchange at State Road 46;
- b. continued use of the existing Arlington Road overpass;
- c. closure of Acuff Road, subject to the construction of a cul-de-sac on the west side of the interstate and the reconstruction of the intersection of Prow Road and Acuff Road with the inclusion of a horizontal curve versus the existing intersection;



- d. construction of an overpass at Kinser Pike and approach road improvements as indicated on the west side to eliminate the substandard geometry and cross-section and to connect with the planned replacement of Monroe County Bridge #46.

Response:

All of these items are included in the Refined Preferred Alternative with the exception of the reconstruction of the intersection of Acuff and Prow Road, which is outside of the project limits.

LG010-43 Comment:

2. KARST - This area has Karst features that require avoidance and protection during construction. Erosion control measures shall be adhered to in order to protect these features. Recommend that Monroe County Code Chapters 761, Storm Water Management, and 829, Karst and Sinkhole Development Standards, be applied (attached).

Response:

Please refer to LG010-03 response.

LG010-44 Comment:

3. DRAINAGE - Impacts to the all bridges and drainage structures shall be evaluated for construction impacts during the design phase with a review by the Monroe County Highway Department. All hydraulic studies and information regarding storm water runoff impacts shall be available for review and comment as the detailed design plans are prepared in accordance with Monroe County Code 761, the Storm Water Management Ordinance. This is needed in order to assess the capabilities of downstream structures to adequately handle increased runoff from this facility.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-03 response.

LG010-45 Comment:

4. EMERGENCY SERVICES - Emergency response time will be hindered by closures in this subsection. Further discussion with the Sheriff Department, Emergency Management Department and the fire departments that serve this area, Bloomington City and Bloomington Township Fire Departments should be conducted to assure their response times are adequate to serve the public need.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Response:

Please refer to LG001-02 response.

LG010-46 Comment:

5. ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION - Alternative modes of transportation should be considered along this segment. Many bicyclists utilize the road network in this area of Monroe County of which accommodations should be reviewed and constructed with grade separations. Compliance and application of the INDOT's Context Sensitive Solutions policies, which can further incorporate Bloomington Monroe County MPO's Complete Street Policy, adopted January 9, 2009, and Monroe County's Alternative Transportation and Greenways Plan, adopted by the Board of Commissioners via Resolution 2006-08 should be adhered to.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-21 response regarding general issue of incorporation of other local plans.

LG010-47 Comment:

6. CONSTRUCTION - Construction plans and phasing shall be reviewed and approved by Monroe County Highway Department with input from the Monroe County Sheriff Department and other emergency response agencies. Coordination of construction related activities shall be provided until completed. Routing of construction materials shall be reviewed and approved by Monroe County to assure weight limits and loadings are adhered to. Blasting should be coordinated with area limestone quarries in this area to prevent damages to mineral deposits at or near this subsection.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-24 response.

LG010-48 Comment:

7. THOROUGHFARE PLANS - The Monroe County Thoroughfare Plan, adopted via Monroe County Ordinance 95-28, provides minimum standards for our roadways and the Functional Classification of each road segment. New construction of County Road segments shall comply with the INDOT Road Design Manual as it applies to each road segment that is reconstructed within the footprint of the I-69 environmental document.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-21 and LG006-02 responses.



LG010-49 Comment:

Furthermore, if it is decided to close a road segment, cul-de-sacs shall be constructed at those locations that will provide for a vehicle wheel base of 50 feet to turn around. This is necessary for emergency vehicles, highway maintenance vehicles, school busses and others that may need such an improvement. Also, the Bloomington-Monroe County Long Range Transportation Plan shall be reviewed for compliance for coordination of improvements.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-21 and LG006-02 responses.

LG010-50 Comment:

8. SCHOOLS - With the closure of County Roads, additional impacts will be realized by the Monroe County Community School Corporation due to rerouting of busses in this area. Kinser Pike has a large impact on area school transportation. Communication shall occur with the MCCSC Transportation Department in order to minimize the additional costs of a permanent detour.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-26 response.

LG010-51 Comment:

9. NOISE ANALYSIS - This area is rural in nature except nearing State Road 37 which is largely estate residential. Landscaping or noise mitigation should be provided for minimizing noise impacts in the area.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-39 response. As the comment notes, this area is rural in nature. The noise analysis conducted for this project determined that noise abatement is not reasonable and/or feasible in this area. See FEIS Section 5.10, *Highway Noise*.

LG010-52 Comment:

10. AESTHETICS - Aesthetic interchange and grade separation treatments are desired in this community. There exist several options that INDOT is familiar with such as form liners for abutment walls, piers and bridge railing to stamped and/or colored concrete for the same. Areas of native grasses or wildflower plantings could be added to enhance the interchanges and grade separations. The Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce has formed a committee, consisting local government officials and private interests that is investigating the various options and recommend the INDOT work with this group to select a common theme throughout the corridor.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Response:

Please refer to LG007-13 response.

LG010-52A Comment:

COUNTY ROAD NAME	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	ADT ROAD WIDTH & SURFACE	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS
State Road 46	None – use of existing interchange	Arterial	INDOT Concrete pavement	Concur with the use of the existing interchange.
Arlington Road	Overpass	Arterial	9,695 24 feet w/ paved shoulders Bituminous pavement	Support the use of the existing overpass bridge.
Acuff Road	Closed	Local	1,015 20 feet Bituminous surface	Concur with closure subject to; 1) construction of a cul-de-sac or acceptable turnaround on west side of interstate; and, 2) reconstruction of the intersection of Acuff Road and Prow Road with a horizontal curve for better traffic movements.
Acuff Road (continued)				
Kinser Pike	Overpass	Major Collector	244 20 feet Bituminous surface	Road will be closed to interstate access. Road will remain open to traffic as proposed in the DEIS with the construction of an overpass. Recommendations: 1) Support Grade Separation. 2) Kinser Pike shall be widened from north of the overpass to Monroe Bridge #46, inclusive of vertical, horizontal and cross-section improvements in this segment to accommodate additional traffic from Bottom Road. 3) Accommodations for bicycles shall be made per Monroe County Alternative Transportation Plan (on-road, paved shoulder, 5' width) 4) Coordination of the projects has occurred between both agencies and shall continue.



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Response:

Please refer to LG010-42 response. Additionally, bicycle accommodations are provided on Kinser Pike within the 5’ paved shoulder.

LG010-52B Comment:

Maple Grove Road	No construction proposed.	Major Collector	1,281 19 feet Bituminous surface	While this road will not be closed or directly impacted with construction, due to the potential closure of Acuff Road and other area local roads, this roadway could realize increase traffic. Recommendations: 1) Construction traffic shall not use this road as the roadbed is not sufficient for these loads and the road width is insufficient and would create a traffic safety hazard.
------------------	---------------------------	-----------------	--	---

Response:

Please refer to LG010-28B response regarding construction impacts.

LG010-53 Comment:

GENERAL COMMENTS for SUBSECTION 5D
North of Kinser Pike to south of Sample Road

1. TRAFFIC STUDIES, INTERCHANGES & GRADE SEPARATIONS - After a review of Appendix GG, the "I-69 Corridor Model Documentation: Technical Memorandum: Interim Traffic Forecasting Models for I-69 Section 5 DEIS", dated October, 2012, it was found that traffic modeling was conducted on this Section using the latest in available data in order to prepare the 2035 traffic forecast. While a Level of Service (LOS) analysis reviews congestion due to increases in traffic, it does not take into account substandard roadway geometry and cross-sections which will be impacted by the increased vehicles using said roadways. Increased traffic directed to substandard roads is not acceptable and should be addressed with this project for safety of the traveling public. Roadways, where permanently detoured traffic is to travel, should be assessed and improvements shall be made in accordance with the current Indiana Design Manual for the roads that are impacted which do not meet the IDM's criteria for the functional classification of the impacted road.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-17 response.



LG010-54 **Comment:**

In summary, we support Preferred Alternate No. 8 of the DEIS as follows;

- a. the closure of Bottom Road, subject to improvements made to the existing Bottom Road / Kinser Pike segment to properly connect both roadways, and subject to the conditions outlined in the North Walnut Street interchange proposal;
- b. maintain the existing partial interchange at North Walnut Street subject to the construction of a new segment of Sample Road from Bottom Road to the planned interchange at Sample Road and from the interchange to Old State Road 37. This is necessary to maintain traffic flow from the Ellettsville area and developments north of Ellettsville and also to access Blucher Pool, a City of Bloomington Utilities maintained sewage treatment plant and provide safe and adequate access to the interchange from the east. If this is not provided, Monroe County must support the construction of the full interchange at Walnut Street which will provide access to Bottom Road via a direct connection;
- c. construction of a local access road (frontage road) on the east side of the interstate from North Walnut Street to Sample Road. This will allow access to properties on the east side that are currently served by Connaught Road, Ellis Road, Showers Road, Wylie Road (east side), Purcell Drive, and Wayport Road. The proposed cross-section should satisfy that for a Major Collector in accordance with the IDM. On-road opportunities for alternative transportation (5' paved shoulder) should be provided.
- d. Construction of a local access road (frontage road) on the west side of the interstate beginning at the proposed cul-de-sac at Charlie Taylor Road to Sample Road. This will allow access to properties on the west side of the interstate that are currently served by Charlie Taylor Road, Griffith Cemetery Road, Wylie Road (west side), and Stonebelt Drive. On-road opportunities for alternative transportation (5' paved shoulder) should be provided.

Response:

- a. The Refined Preferred Alternative includes the closure of Bottom Road, as well as improvements to Kinser Pike between Bottom Road and existing SR 37.
- b. Please refer to AF002-46 response regarding Walnut Interchange and LG001-03 response regarding connections from Sample Road interchange..
- c. The Refined Preferred Alternative includes a local access road on the east side of I-69, extending from Connaught Road to Sample Road. The design criteria for this roadway is "Rural Collector, Local-Agency." Please note that the access road does not extend as far south as North Walnut Street (see AF002-02 response). The typical sections for local access roads provide for at least a 5 foot wide paved shoulder. See FEIS Figure 5.1-4.
- d. The Refined Preferred Alternative includes a local access road on the west side of I-69, extending from Sample Road to Charlie Taylor Road.



LG010-55 Comment:

2. KARST - This area has Karst features that require avoidance and protection during construction. Erosion control measures shall be adhered to in order to protect these features. Recommend that Monroe County Code Chapters 761, Storm Water Management, and 829, Karst and Sinkhole Development Standards, 761, be applied.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-03 response.

LG010-56 Comment:

3. DRAINAGE - Impacts to the all bridges and drainage structures shall be evaluated for construction impacts during the design phase with a review by the Monroe County Highway Department. All hydraulic studies and information regarding storm water runoff impacts shall be available for review and comment as the detailed design plans are prepared in accordance with Monroe County Code 761, the Storm Water Management Ordinance. This is needed in order to assess the capabilities of downstream structures to adequately handle increased runoff from this facility.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-03 response.

LG010-57 Comment:

4. EMERGENCY SERVICES - Emergency response time will be hindered by closures in this subsection. Further discussion with the Sheriff Department, Emergency Management Department and the fire departments that serve this area, Bloomington City and Bloomington Township Fire Departments should be conducted to assure their response times are adequate to serve the public need.

Response:

Please refer to LG001-02 response.

LG010-58 Comment:

5. ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION - Alternative modes of transportation should be considered along this segment. Many bicyclists utilize the road network in this area of Monroe County of which accommodations should be reviewed and constructed with grade separations. Compliance and application of the INDOT's Context Sensitive Solutions policies, which can further incorporate Bloomington Monroe County MPO's Complete Street Policy, adopted January 9, 2009, and Monroe County's Alternative Transportation and Greenways Plan, adopted by the Board of Commissioners via Resolution 2006-08, should be adhered to.



Response:

Please refer to LG007-21 response regarding general issue of incorporation of other local plans.

LG010-59 Comment:

6. CONSTRUCTION - Construction plans and phasing shall be reviewed and approved by Monroe County Highway Department with input from the Monroe County Sheriff Department and other emergency response agencies. Coordination of construction related activities shall be provided until completed. Routing of construction materials shall be reviewed and approved by Monroe County to assure weight limits and loadings are adhered to.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-24 response.

LG010-60 Comment:

7. THOROUGHFARE PLANS - The Monroe County Thoroughfare Plan, adopted via Monroe County Ordinance 95-28, provides minimum standards for our roadways and the Functional Classification of each road segment. New construction of County Road segments shall comply with the INDOT Road Design Manual as it applies to each road segment that is reconstructed within the footprint of the I-69 environmental document. Furthermore, if it is decided to close a road segment, cul-de-sacs shall be constructed at those locations that will provide for a vehicle wheel base of 50 feet to turn around. This is necessary for emergency vehicles, highway maintenance vehicles, school busses and others that may need such an improvement. Also, the Bloomington-Monroe County Long Range Transportation Plan shall be reviewed for compliance for coordination of improvements.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-21 and LG006-02 responses.

LG010-61 Comment:

8. SCHOOLS - With the closure of County Roads, additional impacts will be realized by the Monroe County Community School Corporation due to rerouting of busses in this area. The school systems rely on our existing transportation network for bus routes. Communication shall occur with the MCCSC Transportation Department in order to minimize the additional costs of a permanent detour..



Response:

Please refer to LG010-26 response.

LG010-62 Comment:

9. NOISE ANALYSIS - This area is rural in nature. Landscaping should be providing for minimizing noise impacts to this area.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-39 response. As the comment notes, this area is rural in nature. The noise analysis conducted for this project determined that noise abatement is not reasonable and/or feasible in this area. See FEIS Section 5.10, *Highway Noise*.

LG010-63 Comment:

10. AESTHETICS - Aesthetic interchange and grade separation treatments are desired in this community. There exist several options that INDOT is familiar with such as form liners for abutment walls, piers and bridge railing to stamped and/or colored concrete for the same. Areas of native grasses or wildflower plantings could be added to enhance the interchanges and grade separations. The Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce has formed a committee, consisting local government officials and private interests that is investigating the various options and recommend the INDOT work with this group to select a common theme throughout the corridor.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-13 response.

LG010-63A Comment:

COUNTY ROAD NAME	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	ADT ROAD WIDTH & SURFACE	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS
Bottom Road	Close at the current location	Major Collector	772 20 feet Bituminous surface	Concur with closure at the current location subject to improvements to the existing Bottom Road / Kinser Pike segment for proper connectivity.
North Walnut Street	Option A – full access interchange (single point)	Arterial	10,717 24 feet w/ paved shoulders Bituminous surface	Option A provides full access to Bottom Road, a concern for Monroe County. Bottom Road serves the Ellettsville community and the developments surrounding it. It further serves as the main access to the City of Bloomington’s Blucher Pool, a sewage



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

<p>North Walnut Street (continued)</p>	<p>Or</p> <p>Option B – use of the existing partial interchange</p>			<p>treatment facility. This option would provide the best access to the traveling public in this area however may create environmental concerns.</p> <p>Option B utilizes the existing partial interchange with no changes nor access to the west. This will be an issue for those that currently utilize Bottom Road since it will not have connectivity to the interchange. It also lessens environmental impacts and financial impacts to the project.</p> <p>Local problems, needs and concerns to address in this area are as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Provide adequate east / west traffic flow and interstate access from Ellettsville area and northwest Monroe County. 2) Indiana University’s primary concern is traffic flow to and from athletic events. 3) Concern with access to the City of Bloomington Utilities Blucher Pool on Bottom Road for septage haulers and for delivery of supplies to said location. 4) Most of planned high density residential development will occur in the Ellettsville Rural Community area and the area around the planned interchange at Sample Road. Thus, both areas will need adequate access to the interstate to accommodate future growth in this part of the County. <p>County will support Option B provided a road is constructed with the assistance from the INDOT that connects Bottom Road and the Sample Road interchange. This would provide for the traffic movements generated from the areas we are concerned with providing access to. If this cannot be accomplished, Option A is supported.</p>
--	---	--	--	--



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

<p>Eastern Access Road</p>	<p>New construction of two lane roadway</p>	<p>Major Collector</p>	<p>Serves Connaught Road, Ellis Road, Showers Road, Wylie Road (east side), Purcell Drive, and Wayport Road (east side)</p>	<p>This proposed roadway along the east side of the interstate from North Walnut Street to Sample Road will serve as a frontage road for this area. The properties connected will have access as known today. In some area, a new southbound lane will be constructed and the existing northbound lane will be used as the frontage road in this Subsection. Recommendations; 1) Support reconstruction as proposed subject to; a) Design of road satisfy IDM requirements for a Major Collector b) Aesthetic median protection from the interstate and the access road shall be provided as deemed necessary and offsets between the edge of pavements of both facilities should be as far as possible, satisfying Figure 3-8 in the DEIS. c) Accommodations for bicycles shall be made per Monroe County Alternative Transportation Plan (on-road, paved shoulder, 5' width)</p>
<p>Western Access Road</p>	<p>New construction of two lane roadway</p>	<p>Major Collector</p>	<p>Serves Charlie Taylor Road, Griffith Cemetery Road, Wylie Road (west side), and Stonebelt Drive, Wayport Drive (west side)</p>	<p>This proposed roadway along the west side of the interstate from Charlie Taylor Road to Sample Road will serve as a frontage road for this area. The properties connected will have access as known today. In some areas, a new southbound lane will be constructed and the existing northbound lane will be used as the frontage road in this Subsection. Recommendations; 1) Support reconstruction as proposed subject to; a) Design of road satisfy IDM requirements for a Major Collector b) Aesthetic median protection from the interstate and the access road shall be provided as deemed necessary and offsets between the edge of pavements of both facilities</p>



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Western Access Road (continued)				<p>should be as far as possible, satisfying Figure 3-8 in the DEIS.</p> <p>c) Accommodations for bicycles shall be made per Monroe County Alternative Transportation Plan (on-road, paved shoulder, 5' width)</p>
---------------------------------	--	--	--	---

Response:

Please refer to LG010-54 response. The Western Access Road is separated from the southbound I-69 lanes by a median (typical width of 60 feet). Median protection is not prescribed at this location.

LG010-63B Comment:

Existing local roads in the area.	No construction proposed.	Local		While roads may be closed to direct access or indirectly impacted with construction in this area, it is required that construction traffic not use local roads in this area as the roadbeds are not sufficient for these loads and the road widths are insufficient and would create a traffic safety hazard.
-----------------------------------	---------------------------	-------	--	---

Response:

Please refer to LG010-28B response regarding construction impacts.

LG010-64 Comment:

GENERAL COMMENTS for SUBSECTION 5E

South of Sample Road to Monroe / Morgan County Line

1. TRAFFIC STUDIES INTERCHANGES & GRADE SEPARATIONS - After a review of Appendix GG, the "I-69 Corridor Model Documentation: Technical Memorandum: Interim Traffic Forecasting Models for I-69 Section 5 DEIS", dated October, 2012, it was found that traffic modeling was conducted on this Section using the latest in available data in order to prepare the 2035 traffic forecast. While a Level of Service (LOS) analysis reviews congestion due to increases in traffic, it does not take into account substandard roadway geometry and cross-sections which will be impacted by the increased vehicles using said roadways. Increased traffic directed to substandard roads is not acceptable and should be addressed with this project for safety of the traveling public. Roadways, where permanently detoured traffic is to travel, should be assessed and improvements shall be made in accordance with the current Indiana Design Manual for the roads that



are impacted which do not meet the IDM's criteria for the functional classification of the impacted road.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-17 response.

LG010-65 Comment:

In summary, we support Preferred Alternate No.8 of the DEIS as follows;

- a. construction of a local access road (frontage road) on the east side of the interstate from south of Sample Road to Chambers Pike. This will allow access to properties on the east side that are currently served by State Road 37, Wayport Road, Duxbury Drive, Oliver Winery Road, Fox Hollow Road, Wesner Woods Road and Sparks Lane. The existing northbound lane of State Road 37 will be converted to the frontage road and a new southbound lane will be constructed on the west side of the interstate. The proposed cross-section should satisfy that for a Major Collector in accordance with the IDM. On-road opportunities for alternative transportation (5' paved shoulder) should be provided.
- b. the single folded diamond as proposed at Sample Road, with the travel lanes to accommodate anticipated improvements for Sample Road, east to Old State Road 37 and west to Bottom Road, from the interstate, inclusive of alternative transportation improvements,
- c. all pavement markings in the State Right -of-Way shall be the responsibility of the INDOT to maintain
- d. construction of a local access road (frontage road) on the west side of the interchange from south of Sample Road to Burma Road. This will allow access to properties on the west side that are currently served by State Road 37, Simpson Chapel Road, Lee Paul Road, Norm Anderson Road, Crossover Road, Dittimore Road, Mann Road, Sylvan Lane and Burma Road. The proposed cross-section should satisfy that for a Major Collector in accordance with the IDM. On-road opportunities for alternative transportation (5' paved shoulder) should be provided. There are connections proposed to existing, substandard County Roads, such as segments of Lee Paul Road, Simpson Chapel Road, and Sample Road that should be improved in accordance with the IDM as these segments will realize increased loading and traffic. These segments need to be investigated further by INDOT to determine their ability to perform in the long term in their current condition, geometrically and from a load carrying standpoint.
- e. construction of an overpass at Chambers Pike and approach road improvements as proposed.
- f. relocation and reconstruction of Sparks Road subject to a cul-de-sac or turnaround at the west end.
- g. the addition of a truck lane for southbound traffic north of Burma Road



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

- h. the closure of Bryant's Creek Road subject to the construction of a cul-de-sac on the east side of the interstate and assistance with providing improvements to drainage in the area as it has a history of flooding and could strand up to nine residences if an event occurs
- i. the closure of Petro Road provided all properties are purchased and homeowners relocated as proposed.
- j. the closure of Cooksey Lane provided all properties are purchased and homeowners relocated as proposed.
- k. closure of Turkey Track Road with access provided to north in Morgan County.

Response:

- a. The Refined Preferred Alternative includes the use of the existing northbound SR 37 lanes as the east side local access road between Sample Road and the vicinity of Norm Anderson Road. From that point north to Chambers Pike, the access road is constructed parallel to the I-69 lanes. The design criteria for this roadway is "Rural Collector, Local-Agency."
- b. The Refined Preferred Alternative includes the interchange at Sample Road; however, the specific interchange design will be determined in the final design phase, within the proposed right-of-way footprint shown in FEIS. Please see LG001-03 response for discussion of the local road improvements associated with Lawson Road. Improvements along the east leg of Sample Road do not extend east of the local access road construction.
- c. INDOT maintains all pavement markings within the state right of way.
- d. The Refined Preferred Alternative includes the construction of a parallel access road between Simpson Chapel Road and Burma Road. The design criteria for this roadway is "Rural Collector, Local-Agency." Lee Paul Road is no longer included as part of the local access road system. Please see LG010-05 response for discussion of relationship of facilities constructed as part of the Section 5 project and their relationship to the local road system.
- e. An overpass at Chambers Pike is included as part of the Refined Preferred Alternative.
- f. The Refined Preferred Alternative includes the relocation/reconstruction of Sparks Lane.
- g. The Refined Preferred Alternative includes the construction of a southbound truck climbing lane north of Burma Road.
- h. A cul-de-sac is included for the west end of Bryant's Creek Road as part of the Refined Preferred Alternative. While flooding occurs as an existing condition on Bryant's Creek Road, 2 residences are located between existing SR 37 and the first location where the creek frequently floods. Any properties east of that ford are subject to existing flooding conditions which are not altered as a result of the I-69 project. The disposition of those first 2 residences immediately east of I-69 will be determined during the final design phase.



- i. The Refined Preferred Alternative includes the closure of Petro Road, noting potential displacement of all properties along the road. The final determination regarding access versus acquisition will be made in the final design stage.
- j. The Refined Preferred Alternative includes the closure of Cooksey Lane, noting potential displacement of all properties along the road. The final determination regarding access versus acquisition will be made in the final design stage.
- k. The Refined Preferred Alternative includes closure of the intersection of Turkey Track Road/SR 37 intersection at the Monroe County line. Access for those residents south of the county line is provided north through Morgan County as noted.

LG010-66 Comment:

2. KARST - This area has Karst features that require avoidance and protection during construction. Erosion control measures shall be adhered to in order to protect these features. Recommend that Monroe County Code Chapters 761, Storm Water Management, and 829, Karst and Sinkhole Development Standards, be applied.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-03 response.

LG010-67 Comment:

3. DRAINAGE - Flash flooding occurs on Bryant's Creek Road from Bryant's Creek. There currently are no drainage structures along this road segment between State Road 37/I-69 and Old State Road 37. There are 11 residences along this roadway. Assistance with providing drainage structures shall be evaluated for this area in conjunction with construction impacts during the design phase with a review by the Monroe County Highway Department. All hydraulic studies and information regarding storm water runoff impacts shall be available for review and comment as the detailed design plans are prepared in accordance with Monroe County Code 761, the Storm Water Management Ordinance. This is needed in order to assess the capabilities of downstream structures to adequately handle increased runoff from this facility.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-03 and LG010-65 (Item h.) responses.

LG010-68 Comment:

4. EMERGENCY SERVICES - Emergency response time will be hindered by closures in this subsection. Further discussion with the Sheriffs Department, Emergency Management Department and the fire departments that serve this area, Bloomington City and Bloomington Township Fire Departments should be conducted to assure their response times are adequate to serve the public need.



Response:

Please refer to LG001-02 response.

LG010-69 Comment:

5. ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION - Alternative modes of transportation should be considered along this segment. Many bicyclists utilize the road network in this area of Monroe County of which accommodations should be reviewed and constructed with grade separations. Compliance and application of the INDOT's Context Sensitive Solutions policies, which can further incorporate Bloomington Monroe County MPO's Complete Street Policy, adopted January 9, 2009, and Monroe County's Alternative Transportation and Greenways Plan, adopted by the Board of Commissioners via Resolution 2006-08, should be adhered to.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-21 response regarding general issue of incorporation of other local plans.

LG010-70 Comment:

6. CONSTRUCTION - Construction plans and phasing shall be reviewed and approved by Monroe County Highway Department with input from the Monroe County Sheriff Department and other emergency response agencies. Coordination of construction related activities shall be provided until completed. Routing of construction materials shall be reviewed and approved by Monroe County to assure weight limits and loadings are adhered to.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-24 response.

LG010-71 Comment:

7. THOROUGHFARE PLANS - The Monroe County Thoroughfare Plan, adopted via Monroe County Ordinance 95-28, provides minimum standards for our roadways and the Functional Classification of each road segment. New construction of County Road segments shall comply with the INDOT Road Design Manual as it applies to each road segment that is reconstructed within the footprint of the I-69 environmental document. Furthermore, if it is decided to close a road segment, cul-de-sacs shall be constructed at those locations that will provide for a vehicle wheel base of 50 feet to turn around. This is necessary for emergency vehicles, highway maintenance vehicles, school busses and others that may need such an improvement. Also, the Bloomington-Monroe County Long Range Transportation Plan shall be reviewed for compliance for coordination of improvements.



Response:

Please refer to LG007-21 and LG006-02 responses.

LG010-72 Comment:

8. SCHOOLS - With the closure of County Roads, additional impacts will be realized by the Monroe County Community School Corporation due to rerouting of busses in this area. Communication shall occur with the MCCSC Transportation Department in order to minimize the additional costs of a permanent detour.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-26 response.

LG010-73 Comment:

9. NOISE ANALYSIS - This area is rural in nature. Landscaping should be providing for minimizing noise impacts to this area.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-39 response. As the comment notes, this area is rural in nature. The noise analysis conducted for this project determined that noise abatement is not reasonable and/or feasible in this area. See FEIS Section 5.10, *Highway Noise*.

LG010-74 Comment:

10. AESTHETICS - Aesthetic interchange and grade separation treatments are desired in this community. There exist several options that INDOT is familiar with such as form liners for abutment walls, piers and bridge railing to stamped and/or colored concrete for the same. Areas of native grasses or wildflower plantings could be added to enhance the interchanges and grade separations. The Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce has formed a committee, consisting local government officials and private interests that is investigating the various options and recommend the INDOT work with this group to select a common theme throughout the corridor.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-13 response.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

LG010-74A Comment:

COUNTY ROAD NAME	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	ADT ROAD WIDTH & SURFACE	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS
Local Access Road (east)	None – mainline shift allows for use of existing northbound lane as frontage road.	Major Collector	Serves State Road 37, Wayport Road (east side), Duxbury Drive, Oliver Winery Road, Fox Hollow Road, Wesner Woods Road and Sparks Lane	This proposed roadway along the east side of the interstate from south of Sample Road to Chambers Pike will serve as a frontage road for this area. The properties connected will have access as known today. In most of this area, a new southbound lane will be constructed and the existing northbound lanes will be used as the frontage road in this Subsection. Recommendations; 1) Support reconstruction as proposed subject to; a) Design of road satisfy IDM requirements for a Major Collector b) Aesthetic median protection from the interstate and the access road shall be provided as deemed necessary and offsets between the edge of pavements of both facilities should be as far as possible, satisfying Figure 3-8 in the DEIS. c) Accommodations for bicycles shall be made per Monroe County Alternative Transportation Plan (on-road, paved shoulder, 5' width)
Sample Road	Interchange	Major Collector	West side 582 18 feet Bituminous surface East side 1,080 20 feet Bituminous surface	Road will remain open to traffic as proposed in the DEIS with the construction of a single folded interchange. The road segment will realize increase in traffic due to the closure of access from the interstate at Bottom Road and Simpson Chapel Road. As stated in the recommendations for the North Walnut Street partial interchange (Option B), it is necessary to improve Sample Road from Bottom Road to Old State Road 37 due to; 1) Provide adequate east / west traffic flow and interstate access from Ellettsville area and northwest Monroe County. 2) Concern with access to the



<p>Sample Road (continued)</p>				<p>City of Bloomington Utilities Blucher Pool on Bottom Road for septage haulers and for delivery of supplies to said location.</p> <p>3) Most of planned high density residential development will occur in the Ellettsville Rural Community area and the area around the planned interchange at Sample Road. Thus, both areas will need adequate access to the interstate to accommodate future growth in this part of the County.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Support Interchange subject to; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) A single folded diamond interchange is proposed at this location, with the travel lanes to accommodate anticipated future traffic. b) All markings within the Right-of-Way shall remain the responsibility of INDOT to maintain. c) improvements for Sample Road, east to Old State Road 37 and west to Bottom Road, from the interstate, inclusive of alternative transportation improvements, d) Accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians shall be made per Monroe County Alternative Transportation Plan (on-road, 5' paved shoulder).
<p>Local Access Road (west)</p>	<p>New construction of two lane road</p>	<p>Major Collector</p>	<p>Serves State Road 37, Simpson Chapel Road, Lee Paul Road, Norm Anderson Road, Crossover Road, Dittimore Road, Mann Road, Sylvan</p>	<p>This proposed roadway along the west side of the interstate from south of Sample Road to Burma Road will serve as a frontage road for this area. The properties connected will have access as known today. In most of this area, a new southbound lane will be constructed and the existing northbound lanes will be used as the frontage road in this Subsection.</p> <p>Recommendations;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Support reconstruction as proposed subject to;



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Local Access Road (west) (continued)			Lane and Burma Road	<p>a) Design of road satisfy IDM requirements for a Major Collector</p> <p>b) Aesthetic median protection from the interstate and the access road shall be provided as deemed necessary and offsets between the edge of pavements of both facilities should be as far as possible, satisfying Figure 3-8 in the DEIS.</p> <p>c) improvements to the connections proposed to existing, substandard County Roads, such as segments of Lee Paul Road, Simpson Chapel Road, and Sample Road which should be improved in accordance with the IDM as these segments will realize increased loading and traffic.</p> <p>d) Accommodations for bicycles shall be made per Monroe County Alternative Transportation Plan (on-road, paved shoulder, 5' width)</p>
Crossover Road / Chambers Pike	Overpass	Minor Collector	West side 433 East side 457	<p>Road will be closed to interstate access. Road will remain open to traffic as proposed in the DEIS with the construction of an overpass. The road segment will realize increase in traffic due to closure of That Road. (sic)</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Support Grade Separation. 2) Accommodations for bicycles shall be made per Monroe County Alternative Transportation Plan (on-road, paved shoulder, 5' width)
Sparks Lane	Relocation to Chambers Pike	Local	ADT UK 18 feet Bituminous surface	<p>Road will be closed to interstate access. Road will be relocated to connect with Chambers Pike.</p> <p>Recommendation;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Support relocation subject to construction of a turnaround at west end of Sparks Lane.

I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Bryant’s Creek Road	Close	Local	36 18 feet Gravel	Road will be closed to interstate access. A cul-de-sac will be constructed at the terminus with the interstate. Recommendations; 1) Support closure subject to; a) INDOT provide assistance with improvements to drainage in the area as it has a history of flooding and could strand up to nine residences if an event occurs
Petro Road	Close	Local	ADT UK 18 feet Bituminous surface	Road will be closed to interstate access and the properties purchase by INDOT. Recommendation; Support closure provided all properties are purchased and homeowners relocated as proposed.
Cooksey Lane Cooksey Lane (continued)	Close	Local	ADT UK 18 feet Bituminous surface	Road will be closed to interstate access and the properties purchase by INDOT. Recommendation; Support closure provided all properties are purchased and homeowners relocated as proposed.

Please refer to LG010-65 response.

LG010-74B Comment:

Existing local roads in the area.	No construction proposed.	Local		While roads may be closed to direct access or indirectly impacted with construction in this area, it is required that construction traffic not use local roads in this area as the roadbeds are not sufficient for these loads and the road widths are insufficient and would create a traffic safety hazard.
-----------------------------------	---------------------------	-------	--	---

Response:

Please refer to LG010-28B response regarding construction impacts.

LG010-75 Comment:

GENERAL COMMENTS for SUBSECTION 5F

Monroe / Morgan County Line to Northern Terminus of Section 5, north of Liberty Church Road



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

1. TRAFFIC STUDIES INTERCHANGES & GRADE SEPARATIONS - After a review of Appendix GG, the "I-69 Corridor Model Documentation: Technical Memorandum: Interim Traffic Forecasting Models for I-69 Section 5 DEIS", dated October, 2012, it was found that traffic modeling was conducted on this Section using the latest in available data in order to prepare the 2035 traffic forecast. While a Level of Service (LOS) analysis reviews congestion due to increases in traffic, it does not take into account substandard roadway geometry and cross-sections which will be impacted by the increased vehicles using said roadways. Increased traffic directed to substandard roads is not acceptable and should be addressed with this project for safety of the traveling public. Roadways, where permanently detoured traffic is to travel, should be assessed and improvements shall be made in accordance with the current Indiana Design Manual for the roads that are impacted which do not meet the IDM's criteria for the functional classification of the impacted road.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-17 response. Note that local roads in Subsection 5F are in Morgan County.

LG010-76

Comment:

In summary, we support Preferred Alternate No.8 of the DEIS as follows;

- a. the construction of a local access road that connects segments of Old State Road 37 to the west side of the proposed interchange at Liberty Church Road. This will provide an emergency route should the interstate have to be closed for any reason.

Response:

Comment noted. The Refined Preferred Alternative includes the requested local access road.

LG010-77

Comment:

2. KARST - Not in Monroe County jurisdiction.

Response:

Comment noted.

LG010-78

Comment:

3. DRAINAGE - Not in Monroe County jurisdiction.

Response:

Comment noted.



LG010-79 Comment:

4. EMERGENCY SERVICES - Emergency response time will be hindered by closures in this subsection. Suggest further discussion with the Sheriffs Department, Emergency Management Department and local fire departments that serve this area should be conducted to assure their response times are adequate to serve the public need.

Response:

Please refer to LG001-02 response.

LG010-80 Comment:

5. ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION - Not in Monroe County jurisdiction.

Response:

Comment noted.

LG010-81 Comment:

6. CONSTRUCTION - Not in Monroe County jurisdiction.

Response:

Comment noted.

LG010-82 Comment:

7. THOROUGHFARE PLANS - Not in Monroe County jurisdiction.

Response:

Comment noted.

LG010-83 Comment:

8. SCHOOLS - With the closure of County Roads, additional impacts will be realized by the school corporations due to rerouting of busses in this area. Suggest continuing communication with the school's transportation department in order to minimize the additional costs of a permanent detour.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-26 response. Note that Subsection 5F is in Morgan County.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

LG010-84 **Comment:**

9. NOISE ANALYSIS - Not in Monroe County jurisdiction.

Response:

Comment noted.

LG010-85 **Comment:**

10. AESTHETICS - Aesthetic interchange and grade separation treatments are desired in this community. There exist several options that INDOT is familiar with such as form liners for abutment walls, piers and bridge railing to stamped and/or colored concrete for the same. Areas of native grasses or wildflower plantings could be added to enhance the interchanges and grade separations. The Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce has formed a committee, consisting local government officials and private interests that is investigating the various options and recommend the INDOT work with this group to select a common theme throughout the corridor.

References, both Monroe County Code links and previously submitted documents;

- 1) I-69 Planning Community Planning Grant report titled "*Monroe County State Road 37 Corridor Plan*", dated February, 2010. (See DEIS, Chapter 12)
- 2) Monroe County Code 761, "*Storm Water Management*", located under Title 7,
<http://www.co.monroe.in.us/tsd/Government/Support/Legal/MonroeCountyCode.aspx> or go to direct link at;
http://www.co.monroe.in.us/TSD/DesktopModules/Bring2mind/DMX/Download.aspx?TabID=266&Command=Core_Download&EntryId=3040&PortalId=0&TabId=266
- 3) Monroe County Code 829, "*Karst and Sinkhole Development Standards*", located under Title 8,
<http://www.co.monroe.in.us/tsd/Government/Support/Legal/MonroeCountyCode.aspx> or go to direct link at;
http://www.co.monroe.in.us/TSD/DesktopModules/Bring2mind/DMX/Download.aspx?TabID=383&Command=Core_Download&EntryId=24958&PortalId=0&TabId=383
- 4) Monroe County Ordinance 95-28, "Monroe County Thoroughfare Plan" (See DEIS, Chapter 12)
- 5) Monroe County "Alternative Transportation & Greenways Plan" (See DEIS, Chapter 12)

Response:

Please refer to LG007-13 response. Note that Subsection 5F is in Morgan County.



LG011 **1/2/2013 E-mail (Baker)/Letter**
Devin Blankenship, Chair, Monroe County Historic Preservation Board

LG011-01 **Comment:**

Submitted by E-mail 1/2/2013 Jackie Scanlan
Senior Planner, Monroe County Planning Department
Historic Preservation Board of Review

Please find attached the comments from the Monroe County Historic Preservation Board of Review regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Tier 2) for the I-69, Evansville to Indianapolis project for Section 5 between Bloomington and Martinsville, Indiana.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comment.

1/2/2013 Letter (Blankenship), Monroe County Historic Preservation Board of Review

After careful review, our board would like to highlight issues regarding the following historic properties:

- (1) The Hedrick House: This house was locally designated in November 2012 as an historic district, approved by the Monroe County Commissioners in accordance with the County's historic preservation ordinance. Furthermore, additional prehistoric artifacts beyond those initially described have been reported from the property around the house.
- (2) Maurice Head: We concur with the study; no visual impacts.
- (3) Stipp Bender: We concur with the study; no visual impacts.

Response:

Please refer to LG002-01 response. The Hedrick House (located at 3275 Prow Rd.) was determined not to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. For a copy of the *Memorandum Re: 3275 North Prow Road*, please reference Appendix C, *Reports*, of the 800.11.(e) Documentation, located in Appendix N, *Section 106 Documentation*, of the FEIS.

LG011-02 **Comment:**

- (4) Brown School: As the only remaining public school building in Washington Township, we maintain that this site has local significance, illustrates a national consolidation movement, and holds a certain degree of international fame. Thomas L. Brown Elementary school is named after a local educator who taught in one-room schools in Washington Township. This particular township was the first in the county to consolidate all of the schools into one. The land for the school was donated by a local family, who still reside in the immediate vicinity.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

The namesake of the school is buried in Simpson Chapel Cemetery across the road. The school was open for a relatively short period prior to a second major round of consolidation which closed this rural community landmark. The building's exterior maintains the same character as when it opened in 1968. Other area schools have additions and modifications that compromise their architectural integrity; not so with Brown School. Brown School was purchased by local entrepreneur, Bill Cook, in 1984 as a practice facility for a fledgling drum and bugle corps. That group, Star of Indiana, won the Drum Corps International Open Class World Champion title in 1991. The group evolved into Brass Theater and then Blast! Blast won the 2001 Tony Award for Best Special Theatrical Event and the 2001 Emmy Award for Best Choreography. The local community is proud of Brown School's history as both an elementary school and performing arts practice facility. This property is locally significant, and we believe should be determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places in the future. The current I-69 route proposal would have adverse visual impacts on this property as the center line shifts westward, closer to Brown School.

Response:

Please refer to LG002-01 response. The Brown School was determined to be ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places. For more information, please reference Section 2.5, *Thomas L. Brown Elementary School*, of the 800.11.(e) Documentation, located in Appendix N, *Section 106 Documentation*, of the FEIS.

LG011-03

Comment:

- (5) Maple Grove Road: While the report states that the project will “not introduce any visual elements that contrast with the existing visual setting,” extensive steel guardrails and concrete barriers proposed for the I-69 corridor will greatly detract visually from the current rural character of the area around the district and in the expanded district. We find this to be an adverse visual impact. Instead of steel guardrails and concrete barriers, we recommend using quarry blocks as blockade alternatives to steel guardrails and concrete barriers, to avoid creating visual impacts; see discussion in (7) below.

Response:

Please refer to LG002-01 response. It was determined that this undertaking will have no adverse visual effect upon the Maple Grove Road Rural Historic District. For more information, please reference Section 4.2, *Maple Grove Road Rural Historic District*, of the 800.11.(e) Documentation, located in Appendix N, *Section 106 Documentation*, of the FEIS.



LG011-04 **Comment:**

- (6) Reed Historic Landscape District: The district should be expanded to include the Hedrick House at 3275 N. Prow Road, as well as those at 3225, 3215, 2095, and 3065, since former residents were reported to have been associated with quarry work. Census data have not confirmed that the residents did not work there, and employment records for Reed Quarry do not cover the period of significance. Historic records have not countered the longstanding oral history.

Response:

Please refer to LG002-01 response. It was determined that Reed Historic Landscape District should not be expanded to include this property. This was confirmed after consulting parties asked that the inclusion of this property in the district be reconsidered. For more information, please reference Section 2.4, *3275 North Prow Road*, of the 800.11.(e) Documentation; for a copy of the *Memorandum Re: 3275 North Prow Road*, reference Appendix C, *Reports*; and for a copy of ACHP/Consulting Party meeting minutes regarding this property, see Appendix K. All items located in Appendix N, *Section 106 Documentation*, of the FEIS.

LG011-05 **Comment:**

- (7) Reed, Hunter Valley, and North Clear Creek Historic Landscape Districts: The adverse visual impacts on all three districts will be significant and detract from their historic character. Using steel guardrails or concrete barriers goes against the common local practice for safety and traffic lane containment, which uses reject quarry blocks to create a secure separation. There is an incredible abundance of reject quarry blocks in Monroe and Lawrence Counties. It makes far more economic and environmental sense to move these blocks for placement along I-69 than to manufacture and haul concrete or steel rails. Both concrete and steel rails will change the historic character of these three National Register eligible Landscape Districts, and create visual impacts that are avoidable.

Response:

Please refer to LG002-01 response. It was determined that this undertaking will have no adverse visual effect upon the Hunter Valley Historic Landscape District and North Clear Creek Historic Landscape District, and no visual effect upon the Reed Historic Landscape District. For a discussion of effects on the historic properties, reference Sections 4.6 and 4.7, *North Clear Creek Historic Landscape District* and *Hunter Valley Historic Landscape District*, of the 800.11.(e) Documentation; for a copy of the *Identification of Effects Report*, reference Appendix C, *Reports*; and for copies of concurrence letters from ACHP and SHPO, see Appendix K and Appendix I. All items located in Appendix N, *Section 106 Documentation*, of the FEIS.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

LG011-06 **Comment:**

Additionally, we wish to inform government agencies and the public that visual impacts to the historic and natural character of the major entryway into Monroe County and Bloomington can be expected to make the area less attractive and interesting to visitors, and so produce a negative effect on tourism. Affecting tourism in this way creates economic impacts – namely, a decline in tourism revenues. Unlike some serious issues re: I-69/Sec. 5, visual impacts can be avoided by sensitive construction.

We appreciate this opportunity to comment on your study. Please do not hesitate to communicate any thoughts, concerns, or questions to our board using the above contact information.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-13 response. In addition, a stipulation for Context-Sensitive Solutions was provided for in the Section 106 MOA (I.B.). See Appendix J, *MOA*, located in Appendix N, *Section 106 Documentation*, of the FEIS.

LG012 **12/7/2012 E-mail(Baker)**
Linda G. Sievers, Trustee
Bloomington Township

LG012-01 **Comment:**

I'm following up with my comments yesterday concerning noise and light pollution along I-69, Section 5.

I am requesting that the road surface material through Section 5 be sound sensitive due to the expected increase in traffic. I live in the Maple Grove Historic District and we hear some truck traffic, but it will only get worse and more frequent with I-69. In addition, I ask that you consider using lights that face downward and those that do not emit light in all directions.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Response:

Thank you for your comments. The Identification of Effects Report addressed these concerns, as they relate to the Maple Grove Road Rural Historic District. See Appendix N, *Section 106 Documentation*. Determination of the road surface material will be completed during the final design phase. FHWA policy restricts making adjustments for pavement type in the prediction of highway traffic noise levels and using specific pavement types or surface textures as noise abatement measures. Additionally, noise receptors in this area are beyond the distance outlined in INDOT guidance for evaluation. Current sources of ambient light include headlights from traffic on SR 37,



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

lights from churches on North Prow Road and a multi-story office building on West Acuff Road. The project is not expected to introduce any significant additional sources of ambient light in this area.

LG013 **1/2/2013 E-mail (Baker)/Letter**
Larry Wilson, Director Monroe County Planning Department

LG013-01 **Comment:**

1/2/2013 Email transmittal (Wilson)
Please find comments regarding to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement from the Monroe County Plan Commission for Section 5 of the I-69 project.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or comments.

1/2/2013 Letter (Wilson) Monroe County Plan Commission and office of the Monroe County Board of Zoning Appeals

Comments of Monroe County Plan Commission Regarding I-69 Section 5: Bloomington to Martinsville (SR 37 south of Bloomington to SR 39) Tier 2 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

Indiana 37 is the primary north/south traffic corridor for the City of Bloomington and Monroe County already carrying over 20,000 vehicles per day in the proposed I-69-Section 5 corridor. The overriding concern of the Plan Commission is that current and future traffic flow on Indiana 37 not be compromised by design alternatives chosen for Section 5 of I-69. We are greatly concerned that design options which rely principally upon utilization of the existing SR 37 Right-of-Way may create issues regarding safety, emergency access, and aesthetics.

Response:

Design criteria prescribed in the Indiana Design Manual (IDM) have been implemented in the Refined Preferred Alternative and will be required as part of the final design. The criteria are utilized for all freeways (interstates) throughout the Indiana. Interchanges within the Refined Preferred Alternative allow for direct access to the interstate facility and grade separations provide cross-connectivity for all travelers, including emergency service providers. Please refer to LG007-13 response regarding aesthetics.

LG013-02 **Comment:**

The proposal for concrete barriers between I-69 and the new access roads create safety issues due to glare and limited actual separation. The closing of existing SR 37 access points will divert existing traffic to substandard county roads—this issue still has not been fully addressed. We remained concerned that the blockage of the proposed I-69 due to an accident—as occurred on SR 37 at the Morgan County line last week—would leave Bloomington without a direct route to Indianapolis for significant periods. Given



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

the lack of a parallel State Highway (i.e. US 40/I-70) for thru traffic detours, permanent instant message signage should be placed at strategic locations to alert vehicles in advance of accidents, closures, and repair/maintenance delays.

Response:

The use of concrete barrier between I-69 and local access roads is included in the Refined Preferred Alternative in two locations within Monroe County; in the vicinity of Connaught Road and on the east side of I-69, south and east of Norm Anderson Road. The need for glare protection at these locations will be evaluated in the final design phase. Local access roads are incorporated in the Refined Preferred Alternative to convey traffic to interchanges from local roads, and to provide accessibility to portions of the existing highway system whose access changes due to this project. Please see LG010-05 response for use of existing county roads. Comment noted regarding lack of parallel State Highway. The current highway network does not provide an alternate parallel major road connecting Bloomington and Indianapolis; in this respect, I-69 does not change current circumstances. The Refined Preferred Alternative does not provide permanent instant message signs.

LG013-03

Comment:

The Plan Commission again requests that the recommendations of the Monroe County State Road 37 Corridor Plan (February, 2010) and Monroe County Alternative Transportation and Greenways Systems Plan (May, 2006) be followed.

Response:

Recommendations noted. Responses to specific concerns follow.

LG013-04

Comment:

A.) General concerns:

1.) Utilization of Existing SR 37 Right-of-Way

While using the existing SR 37 right-of-way is laudable, using up the existing corridor without acquiring additional right-of-way is short-sighted. One of the significant failings of interstate planning as now performed by INDOT and FHWA is the establishment of a 20 year planning horizon done in a manner that does not accommodate expectations beyond that horizon. Such an approach is a perversion of system lifecycle design practice that can only lead to far more expensive remediation of future problematic situations.

Response:

Traffic forecasts for determining facility capacity are provided 20-25 years into the future. The forecasts prepared for this project indicate that in the Year 2035 (the design



year), the facility provides appropriate levels of service in all portions of the Section 5 project. Especially in the urban areas of Bloomington, it would significantly increase costs, residential and business displacements, and other impacts to accommodate traffic levels which would not be realized for decades. The approach requires projects to balance long-term needs with available and realistic funding.

LG013-05 Comment:

Failing to acknowledge expanded facility use beyond the horizon can only result in excessive future cost to acquire right-of-way for expansion, either by expanding the existing corridor or by establishing a new corridor. Consider how different our situation would be if the current SR 37 corridor did not have capacity for additional travel lanes. Even more important are the expansion needs of interchanges as traffic increases. Future free flow interchange designs necessary to accommodate clearly expected urban traffic increases will be very expensive and the prior failure to acquire the necessary right-of-way is even now limiting current design alternatives.

Given our terrain, as highlighted in the Tier 1 study, there are no other corridor opportunities of this magnitude. Failing to properly size the corridor now, especially the interchange areas, for a sustainable future will result in a failed interstate network segment beyond the current plan horizon. Establishing a plan horizon for sustainable systems does not mean we can ignore system demand growth and response capability after the current horizon is reached.

Response:

Please see LG013-04 response.

LG013-06 Comment:

2.) Free Flow Ingress/Egress at Major Interchanges

As identified in the present four options for major interchanges in Monroe County, no free flow opportunity exists for a left turn onto I-69. All left turn movements onto the interstate will require traversing two signals, one approaching the bridge and another at the left turn point. The preliminary study does mention a single point interchange design alternative but indicates signal delays are longer at a single point interchange.

Response:

Free-flow interchanges require additional right of way and may still have operation problems with weaving movements. The interchanges proposed for I-69 are all forecasted to operate at an acceptable level of service with minimal delay for left turning vehicles even with the presence of traffic signals. See Appendix SS, *Traffic Simulation Modeling Summary*. Specific interchange designs will be determined in the final design phase, within the proposed right-of-way footprint shown in FEIS.



LG013-07 Comment:

We are already experiencing peak hour congestion at the 3rd and 2nd street SR 37 intersections caused by the traffic signal delays. We cannot expect this congestion to be reduced by more interstate traffic using those same intersections. The implementation of our comprehensive plans expects traffic flow through these critical intersections to be hassle-free for motorists so that residing west of I-69 is not perceived as a significant liability.

Response:

Statement is unclear; however, the interchanges proposed for I-69 in Section 5 are forecasted to operate at an acceptable level of service in 2035 with signalized intersections as appropriate. See Appendix SS, *Traffic Simulation Modeling Summary*. Also, note that the opening of I-69 Section 4 (scheduled to occur by the end of 2014) will result in decreases in traffic at the SR 45 interchange. Significant traffic now entering Bloomington from western Monroe and eastern Greene counties via SR 45 will now use I-69.

LG013-08 Comment:

The SR 46 interchange is likely to see the most change over time because of access to Indiana University, our largest employer, to the North Park development, probable location of a future hospital complex, and to the northwestern portion of Monroe County where residential growth around Ellettsville will continue to be significant. None of the current alternatives upgrades that intersection to provide free flow for left turns south or north from SR 46.

Response:

There are environmental constraints such as the Hunter Valley Historic Landscape District and Lemon Lane superfund site that prevent adding free-flow movements (i.e., loop ramps) to the SR 46 interchange for left turn movements from SR 46 to I-69. The proposed interchange configuration in the Refined Preferred Alternative is forecasted to operate at an acceptable level of service with minimal delay for left turning vehicles even with the presence of traffic signals. See Appendix SS, *Traffic Simulation Modeling Summary*. Specific interchange designs will be determined in the final design phase, within the proposed right-of-way footprint shown in FEIS.

LG013-09 Comment:

Karst

Monroe County has regulated construction and development activities in karst areas since 2000. The Monroe County Zoning Ordinance provides as follows:

CHAPTER 829

ZONING ORDINANCE: KARST AND SINKHOLE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS



829-1. Purpose and Intent

The purpose of this chapter is to establish review procedures, use limitations, design standards and performance standards applicable to site developments that encompass or affect sinkholes or other karst features. The intent of this chapter is to protect the public health, safety and welfare by requiring the development and use of environmentally constrained areas to proceed in a manner that promotes safe and appropriate storm water management and ground water quality.

829-2. Policy

Unless expressly stated otherwise or contrary to context, the provisions of this chapter shall be interpreted and applied in accordance with the following policies:

(A) Development in areas that encompass or affect sinkholes or other karst features (i.e., in “sinkhole areas”) is prohibited unless expressly permitted by this chapter or until it is demonstrated that the development would have no significant detrimental impact on storm water management or ground water quality.

(B) Potential impacts on storm water management and ground water quality must be identified, assessed and addressed through written studies at the earliest stages of the development approval process (e.g., during the preliminary plat, development plan or site plan approval stages).

(C) The extent and sophistication of any required study should directly reflect the nature and complexity of the proposed development and of the development site (e.g., the more complex the karst features, the more extensive and sophisticated the study).

(D) All applicable Federal, State and Local permits shall be obtained prior to construction.

These policies and the other provisions of Zoning Ordinance illustrate the longstanding determination of Monroe County government to protect karst structures and prevent groundwater contamination. These policies recognize that the only way to protect karst systems is by keeping construction activity and infrastructure away from sinkholes and other karst features. Under the current zoning ordinance, it is unlikely a driveway would be allowed in much of the proposed I-69 corridor in Monroe County.

Response:

Please refer to LG010-03 response.

LG013-10

Comment:

Spills of fuels and hazardous waste, both during the construction and operation of I-69, are a great concern to Monroe County. The Draft EIS clearly identifies the connectivity of karst structures within the right-of-way to sinking streams and springs. All drainage, including normal highway runoff, should be diverted away from karst areas or filtered



and treated prior to entering sinkholes and swallets. Unless the highway is designed to capture and hold spills, contamination of the karst groundwater systems is inevitable. The requirement of the MOU to install hazardous waste containment should be followed.

Response:

All provisions stipulated in the karst MOU will be followed.

LG013-11

Comment:

Best Management Practices

June, 2010 Survey of Karst Features Report

Pages xvii to xviii

- *Strict runoff/erosion control must be planned, with staging and materials set up outside of karst areas or on impervious surfaces with controlled drainage. Same season revegetation of land disturbed during the construction process should occur when possible*
- *Road maintenance should include posted no-salt/spray areas to prevent contaminants from entering karst systems. Mowing should be restricted to appropriate times, and repairing damaged vegetation and drainages should be required*
- *Some of the channels that cross the corridor may be under-drained in karst areas and appear to transmit water infrequently. Culverts and bridge openings must be sized to accommodate the required rainfall events as defined by the INDOT Drainage Design Manual. Unique backwater conditions created by sinking streams and other insurgence features will require further evaluation during subsequent design stages to assure that adequate detention storage volume is available*
- *The drainage design for I-69 should provide for proper energy dissipation devices at the culvert and storm sewer system outlet locations to prevent erosion to existing channels. Energy dissipater devices include such items as scour holes, riprap linings and stilling basins. Design of energy dissipater devices and ditch linings should be based on INDOT's Drainage Design Manual*
- *Run-off from the roadway should have as much natural treatment as is possible. It is recommended that run-off be dispersed through natural vegetation and/or an engineered treatment system before reaching potential karst recharge features*
- *The roadway construction, when possible, should be planned to maintain the drainage to karst recharge features*



- *Utilization of lined ditches to the outfall discharge points are recommended within the karst areas designed to prevent erosion. Water flow within the roadway ditches will need an analysis for lining requirements. Culvert outlets should be designed to discharge water to at grade terrain. This design will reduce erosion scour and sediment transport into the karst and other environments. Design of ditches and culverts should be based on INDOT's Drainage Design Manual. This will reduce soil erosion through karst features that could compromise the integrity of the roadway*
- *A spill response plan should be established with response equipment readily available during and after road construction. Karst groundwater systems have the potential for high groundwater flow velocities, which makes quick response to any spill a necessity. Drainage and runoff control mechanisms should be in place to prevent contaminants from entering the karst system. In the event that contaminants enter the karst system, use of response or mitigation measures at discharge points may be necessary*
- *If a karst recharge feature cannot be avoided or appropriately filled and capped, the roadway should span the feature and be anchored into competent bedrock. This will avoid the problem of instability and roadway runoff entering the recharge feature*
- *If a spring cannot be avoided or the drainage adequately accommodated by a structure, the roadway should span the spring and be anchored into competent bedrock. This will avoid the potential undermining of the roadbed by excess head pressure and discharge*
- *Cuts into bedrock should be minimized when possible to decrease the potential to expose caves and other karst conduits*
- *If a cave is exposed during construction, karst experts should be consulted to determine the significance of the cave*
- *Per the 1993 Karst MOU, if any federal and/or state listed species are encountered during construction that were not previously noted and evaluated, construction in that area should be halted until the species can be evaluated.*

It is unclear from the Draft EIS if the above Best Management Practices from the June, 2010 Survey Karst Features Report will be adopted for the Project. Please identify which (if any) of the above BMP's will not be implemented and state what alternative practices/standards will be utilized.

Response:

Clarification is provided in Section 7.3, Section 5 *Mitigation Measures and Commitments*, of the FEIS. Where appropriate and practicable, the measures listed in the June, 2010 Survey of Karst Features Report will be adopted for the project. At this point in project development, it is not possible to determine if any of the referenced



BMPs will not be implemented. The Karst Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will be adhered to for Section 5 in order to avoid, minimize and mitigate for impacts to karst features. The above mentioned report was prepared as part of Steps 1-4 of the Karst MOU.

LG013-12 Comment:

B.) Specific concerns:

1.) Elimination of Gates Drive/Vernal Pike Access –

It is essential that an access road connecting 3rd Street and Arlington be constructed on the west side of the proposed I-69 corridor to mitigate for the loss of these heavily used intersections. This will greatly reduce congestion at peak hours on both the Interstate and the interchanges.

Response:

Comment is unclear. 3rd Street and Arlington Road are separated by a considerable distance on the west side of I-69. The Refined Preferred Alternative retains the intersection of Gates Drive and SR 48. Please refer to PI099-01 response regarding an additional connection of Industrial Park Drive and Gates Drive along SR 37/I-69 in the Whitehall Crossing areas, which is a local project already included in the BMCMPPO LRP.

LG013-13 Comment:

2.) Sample Road Interchange

We support an interchange at Sample Road; its ultimate utility depends upon necessary funding to upgrade the east-west roadway to provide access to the Ellettsville area and Old 37.

Response:

Please refer to LG001-03 response regarding connections from Sample Road interchange.

LG013-14 Comment:

3.) Chambers Pike

We note that an overpass of Chambers Pike is now included as requested in our earlier comments.

Response:

Comment noted.



LG013-15 Comment:

4.) Streams

In chapter 5.19.2 Streams it states: “Where stability measures are proposed, alternatives to riprap, such as bioengineering methods, and new construction or retrofit of culverts for Aquatic Organism Passage (AOP) will be considered, where practicable.” A recommendation is that bioengineering materials that are fully biodegradable, natural fibers should be utilized when possible to encourage native plant growth and aquatic organisms. Turf reinforcement mats, made with plastics, tend to persist for such long periods of time and can detour plant growth, especially woody species, and some burrowing organisms from re-colonizing a disturbed area thus hindering restoration efforts

These comments are submitted on behalf, and with the approval, of the Monroe County Plan Commission. We also support the comments of County Highway Engineer Bill Williams, the Board of Monroe County Commissioners and Plan Commission member Richard Martin submitted under separate cover.

Response:

Please refer to AF003-08 response in regards to use of bioengineered materials. Support for other comments received has been noted.

**LG014 12/19/2012 E-mail (Baker)
Lonnie Kern, Washington Township Fire Department**

LG014-01 Comment:

I would like to comment that I would like to see the exit only ramp for legendary hills and i am concerned with then interim plan for Burton Ln. Access to the Jordan Rd. area for us is currently Burton Ln. Burton Ln as I see it is going to span both section 5 and 6. I have concerns for both during construction and after. How will we access Burton Ln\Jordan Rd. during construction. Where will we exit the interstate to access Burton Ln. when section 6 is complete. Also flooding on Burton Ln. is usually too deep and too swift for our trucks to cross. I know this is confusing but I foresee the potential to add several miles to our response under flood conditions if the current grade isn't raised to get the existing road out of flooding potential. We have houses on either side of the area that floods. I suppose this would be much easier to discuss in front of a map.

Response:

This comment primarily addresses design aspects of the project in Section 6. Section 6 design information is not available at this time and is not within the scope of the Section 5 project. Access to this area will be provided from the Liberty Church interchange. Representatives of the team are available to discuss concerns about your access during and after Section 5 construction. Feel free to contact the Section 5 Project Office (812-355-1390).



LG015 **1/2/2013 E-mail (Baker)/Letter**
Cheryl Munson, Incoming Monroe County Council / Monroe County Historic Preservation Board

LG015-01 **Comment:**
E-mail (Baker)
Please find my comments attached.

Letter:

As a citizen, a long-time resident of Monroe County, and an elected public official with more than 16 years in office, I have followed the I-69 development closely and have commented extensively on impacts to the environment and to historic properties. In my view, stopping construction of Section 4 would be the best for the environment and historic properties, and would also reduce the impacts on local transportation and public safety that I-69 will bring to the county. Barring such a halt, I believe Section 5 should be built to help reduce impacts caused by the increased traffic, especially truck traffic, that Section 4 will deliver to SR 37. Those impacts include reduced public safety; downgraded emergency response time; and diminished air quality due to stop-and-go traffic of tractor-trailer rigs dumped onto 37; as well as increased travel time and distance for local commuters and concomitant enlarged monetary and environmental costs that will ensue. But Section 5 as presently planned is not a sufficient remedy. I will address two points for Section 5: (1) connectivity issues and (2) mitigation of impacts on the historic character and tourism values of Monroe County.

Response:

Comments noted. Responses to specific comments provided below. With regard to specific points in this comment:

- The Section 5 project will result in significant crash reductions in Morgan and Monroe County. See FEIS, Table 3-9.
- Section 5 of I-69 (when it is upgraded from SR 37) will operate in freely-flowing conditions; stop-and-go traffic is not forecasted to occur.
- The Section 5 project will provide increased accessibility and reduced travel time to Indianapolis, Martinsville and many destinations throughout southwest Indiana.

LG015-02 **Comment:**

Connectivity

Since its construction, SR 37 has increasingly become THE north-south LOCAL transportation route on the west side of Bloomington and Monroe County. It is widely used by people traveling to work, to stores, and to services. No other north-south road works to connect Victor Pike or Arlington Road to the west side shopping areas at Sam's Club, Walmart, SR 48 area, and Whitehall Crossing. Connectivity is also an issue for emergency response, especially between the SR37/I-69 intersection, SR 45, SR 48, and SR 46.



Poor connectivity can be remedied by building a frontage road for local transportation. Such a road should begin at Victor Pike on the south and extend north to Kinser Pike. Reducing the number of lanes on I-69 from 6 to 4 would be workable because local traffic would use the frontage road. The frontage road should have a side path for pedestrian and bicycle traffic.

Response:

Existing SR 37 is a principal arterial and is not intended to serve local traffic as its primary function. The community has recognized the need for enhanced local north-south roadways, recently completing the expansion of Curry Pike between SR 45 to SR 46. Other local connections (Weimer Road and SR 37 West Frontage Road) are included in the BMCMPPO LRP to provide a local route for north-south travel.

The Refined Preferred Alternative does not include the use of parallel access roads within urban Bloomington. The FEIS describes the consideration of such a feature in the early stages of the environmental study, (see Section 3.2.2.3 and Table 3-3 for a discussion of Alternative 2). Please see LG013-01 for discussion of connectivity for emergency response.

LG015-03

Comment:

If the entirety of the frontage road is not possible, then there needs to be substitute northsouth route provided by INDOT. Extending Gates Drive to Vernal Pike would be helpful, as would extending Cory Lane to Vernal Pike and Arlington Road. Additionally, all the overpasses over I-69 need pedestrian/bicycle paths.

Response:

Please see PI099-01 response regarding an additional connection along SR 37/I-69 in the Whitehall Crossing areas, which is a local project already included in the BMCMPPO LRP. Cory Lane falls within the City of Bloomington’s planning jurisdiction. The Refined Preferred Alternative does not include any improvements on Cory Lane. Please refer to LG008-02 response regarding bicycle/pedestrian accommodations.

LG015-04

Comment:

Mitigating Visual Impacts on Historic Character

The historic character of the Bloomington/Monroe County community is treasured by local residents and draws tourists to our beautiful roadsides with their historic features and attractive natural settings. Three Historic Landscape Districts have been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places because of their association with the limestone industry. A fourth historic district, Indiana’s first National Register Rural Historic District, includes the varied constructions, stone fences, and patterns of association within Maple Grove Road District. All four districts will suffer visual impacts



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

by the planned construction using steel guard rails or concrete barriers along I-69. Under the National Historic Preservation Act, such impacts are to be mitigated when feasible.

Response:

Please refer to LG011-03 response regarding visual impacts to the Maple Grove Road Rural Historic District. Please refer to LG011-05 response regarding visual impacts to the Hunter Valley Historic Landscape District, North Clear Creek Historic Landscape District, and Reed Historic Landscape District. The Section 106 process, documented in FEIS Appendix N, determined that this undertaking either has no adverse visual effect or no visual effect to these four districts. Any mitigation for resources listed on or determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places are described in the Section 106 MOA provided in Appendix J, *MOA*, located *FEIS* Appendix N.

LG015-05

Comment:

Using either steel or concrete barriers will greatly detract from the historic character of the area, and in so doing lessen the touristic appeal of Monroe County. Tourism, of course, provides a significant component for the local economy, and this should be reason enough to mitigate the visual impact, but the local population also appreciates the historic character of our area and wants it preserved.

Solution? Use a more appropriate material for a barrier, namely large blocks of limestone that are rejects from quarry operations. The county has many thousands of these, and they are traditionally used along rural roadways as barriers. Re-using limestone blocks would be especially appropriate in the four historic districts but they could be used any place a steel guardrail or cement barrier is considered. Furthermore, the environmental cost of project construction would be considerably lowered because no steel would need to be produced and shipped. Ditto for concrete. Using locally available construction materials would also benefit the local economy.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Response:

Please refer to LG002-01 response.

LG016

**1/4/13 Letter (Baker)
Kevin Enright, Monroe County Surveyor**

LG016-01

Comment:

In the year 2003 I released my findings based on geographic information systems mapping (GIS) that the proposed I-69 project would be 100 miles longer than existing interstate routes between the same beginning and ending points as Interstate 69. The



Federal Highway Administration (FHA) dismissed my findings as being premature. So, when will the FHA acknowledge that my 2003 GIS findings on the National I-69 project mileage were accurate and correct?

Response:

Please refer to LG004-01 response.

LG016-02 Comment:

I have previously raised my concerns about the falsification of the freight data in the I-69 EIS. Prof. William Black, author of the INDOT freight study for ISTEAs, stated that most of the freight from Southwest Indiana was coal headed to Chicago by freight train. This cost savings data was irrelevant to the Interstate 69 freight analysis. He seemed upset that his scientific study was being misrepresented in the environmental impact statement to show a positive cost-benefit that did not exist.

Response:

As the commenter notes, this information was provided during the Tier 1 study, and was considered at that time. This comment was submitted on February 2, 2004 (comment number 0202091) and documented in the *I-69 Tier 1 ROD Additional Technical Documentation*. It was addressed in Response 7 on page 14 of the *Responses to FEIS Comments* in this technical documentation. No further response to this Tier 1 issue is required.

LG016-03 Comment:

There is transportation theory **Companion Innovations** which basically states that highway construction projects are built to meet economic infrastructure needs (Nadari and Mamuneas FHA Report, 1998). If the stated economic reasons for building I-69 are false, than what are the true economic reasons this highway is being constructed?

Response:

The report cited was reviewed as part of the Tier 1 FEIS in Volume II, Appendix EE, *Relationship Between Interstates and Economic Development*. Following are key findings from the summary of this technical report, as cited in Tier 1 FEIS Appendix EE:

- “Total highway capital has a significant effect on employment, private capital formation and demand for materials inputs in all industries. (p. 2)
- “Given a level of output, an increase in highway capital lead to a reduction in demand for labor and materials and an increase in demand for private capital in all industries. (p. 2)
- “In decades prior to the 1980's, the rates of return on total highway capital were greater than those for private capital. By the 1980's, those rates of return



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

converged, so that the rates of return on total highway capital and on private sector capital are similar. (P.2)

- “At the aggregate level, the contribution of highway capital to Total Factor Productivity (TFP - a measure of industrial productivity) is 0.25. This means that for every 10% increase in highway capital stock, the observed increase in industrial productivity is 2.5%. This productivity tends to highest in manufacturing industries. (p. 2)”

This report was one of several reviewed in Tier 1 (and reviewed in detail in Tier 1 FEIS Appendix EE) to document the relationship between transportation capital investment and economic development. This comment cites, without explanation or elaboration, that the referenced technical report belies the relationship between I-69 and economic development. The Tier 1 FEIS considered this report, and found that it supports the opposite of the assertion this comment makes.

LG016-04

Comment:

I stated at INDOT's I-69 Section 5 public hearing December 6, 2012 that my 2012 GIS study shows the probable economic purpose of this highway is part of converting Crane Warfare Center into a nuclear storage facility. The U.S. Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future (BRC) recommends to the Department of Energy (DOE) the creation of centralized storage facilities located at a national defense installation for storing nuclear waste. I'll include my Thirteen Layers of America's Nuclear Future report as an attachment to this letter.

Determining the location of a new major Nuclear Centralized Storage Facility will have tremendous environmental impacts upon any community. This is especially true for Monroe County and the extensive Karst geology drainage networks.

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for copy of attachment: Thirteen Layers of America's Nuclear Future, ESRI Presentation by Kevin Enright.]

Response:

INDOT knows of no plans to locate a “Nuclear Centralized Storage Facility” within Crane NSA, or any other location within this region. The location of any such facility would be subject to rigorous and highly public environmental studies under the National Environmental Policy Act, as well as other environmental laws. Any connection between the I-69 project and a large-scale nuclear storage facility in this region is spurious and without basis in fact.

Tier 1 I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis EIS identified the corridor of the route serving Crane NSA. Analysis of U.S. plans for nuclear material was not considered in the Tier 1 study.



LG017 **12/12/2012 Letter**
Phil Deckard, Mayor City of Martinsville
Provided by 12/29/2012 E-mail from Ross Holloway, City Engineer

LG017-01 **Comment:**
Attached is the letter from Mayor Deckard with comments on the EIS and a file of an example of the proposed gateway for Martinsville.

Attached letter dated 12/12/2012 (Phil Deckard)

RE: City of Martinsville I-69

The City of Martinsville wants to thank I-69, INDOT and their I-69 Section 5 staff for the many opportunities you have given the City of Martinsville over the past several years to be involved in the EIS. The public comment period is now open on the EIS for Section 5 and the City of Martinsville wants to make formal comments on the EIS as follows:

Response:

INDOT and the I-69 Section 5 Project Team appreciate the involvement of the City in the I-69 Section 5 project as a Participating Agency. Responses to specific comments follow.

LG017-02 **Comment:**

1. The City of Martinsville unequivocally supports the need for the interchange at Liberty Church Road. This interchange is vital to the economic future of the City of Martinsville and the surrounding area. Large portions of this area are in the proposed annexation that was recently adopted by the Council. While, there has been a remonstrance filed, it is believed that the annexation will be successful. Upon completion of the annexation, it is the City's intent to immediately begin the process of including this annexed area into a TIF district to prompt commercial and business development. The City also will be petitioning Morgan County to extend the City's extra-territorial (buffer zone) zoning authority to extend approximately 1/2 mile south of Liberty Church Road and west of State Road 37.

Response:

References to the anticipated TIF District and zoning authority changes are referenced in FEIS Chapter 2, *Purpose and Need* and Section 5.24, *Indirect and Cumulative Impacts*.

LG017-03 **Comment:**

2. The City is planning for a new well field within the next ten (10) years. The primary candidate for this well field is the area west of SR 37 and south of Legendary Hills in the floodway fringe of White River. It is the City's intent through its extra-territorial zoning jurisdiction of this area to limit development west of SR 37 so as to protect the well field. Further, once the location of the wells have been established, the City will be



implementing a well head protection area that will cover a large portion of the area west of SR 37.

Response:

Comment noted. The Refined Preferred Alternative continues to provide for an interchange at Liberty Church Road. The site noted by the City of Martinsville is adjacent to the ramp in the northwest quadrant of the proposed interchange. The construction of the potential well field/well head protection area and the associated limitation of development west of SR 37 would not be hampered by the construction of the Liberty Church Road interchange. Discussion of this potential well field has been added to Chapter 4.3.2, *Water Resources*.

LG017-04 Comment:

3. Proposed access road "N8" appears to conflict with the location where the City of Martinsville has just completed the installation of a new booster station. The cost of this booster station is in excess of \$200,000 and the City is opposed to relocation of the booster station.

Response:

The location of this new booster station has been added to the project records and a description of the feature has been added to the FEIS, Section 4.2.2.5 *Community Facilities and Services*, under utilities. Its presence will be included in the final engineers report advise the design team of its location and the need to coordinate any local access road improvements to minimize/avoid any conflicts during design and construction.

LG017-05 Comment:

4. The City of Martinsville wishes to have a "gateway treatment" at the Liberty Church interchange. Attached is a artist rendering of a "gateway treatment" that was used by the Town of Gosport. Obviously the actual construction would be site sensitive but the general look of the brick with limestone columns would be the City's intent for "gateway treatment".

Response:

Please refer to LG007-13 response.

LG017-06 Comment:

Thank you for this opportunity to submit comments on EIS. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact my office or City Engineer, Ross Holloway.



[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for copy of the attached example artist rendering for gateway treatment.]

Response:

Comment noted.

LG018 **12/31/2012, E-mail (Baker)**
Norman Voyles, Morgan County

LG018-01 **Comment:**

Morgan County Commissioners still favor a "tight" interchange at Liberty Church Rd. rather than at Paragon Rd. We would like an overpass at Paragon Rd. if economics would permit it. We could forego a Paragon Rd. overpass if that would help in securing an Ohio Street interchange and Wal-Mart overpass. I know these are both in Section #6, but we are trying to think "down the road". No pun intended.

Response:

The Refined Preferred Alternative includes a diamond interchange at Liberty Church Road and an overpass at Paragon Road/Pine Blvd. The requests for options to be included in Section 6 are noted, but beyond the limits of this project. INDOT will continue to coordinate with Morgan County officials as the Section 6 portion of the I-69 project progresses.



Public Comments - Individuals

PI001 **10/29/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Roberta Mann

PI001-01 **Comment:**

Has a route been chosen for section 5? I live in and am interested in what has been chosen in the section from Burma Rd to Sample Rd.

Response:

The Refined Preferred Alternative is described in FEIS Section 3.5, *Preferred Alternative*, and is approved in the Record of Decision. Figure 3.13 (sheets 9 to 11) shows the proposed layout of the Sample Road interchange and proposed access road to Burma Road.

PI002 **10/29/2012 E-mail (INDOT)**
Ann Jackson, Sadler Real Estate

PI002-01 **Comment:**

Good evening. This is Ann Jackson from Sadler Real Estate and I am representing my neighbor who resides at: 4655 St. Rd. 37 S., Martinsville, In 46151. I am just inquiring sent as to whether the home in question has been considered as a possible purchase by Indot. since this home is on the direct "foot-print" of the new interstate 67. This home's driveway directly connects to Highway 37 and my clients are willing to relocate. I was inquiring as to when the Right of Decision might happen and if indeed they are being considered? Any information you can enlighten into this process would greatly be appreciated.

Response:

The referenced property has been added as a potential displacement for the Refined Preferred Alternative. However, please note that the final determinations about access, including which properties are acquired, will take place as part of the final design process. You may reach us in the Section 5 Project Office at 3802 Industrial Blvd., Unit 2, Bloomington, IN 47403 (812-355-1390) for a more detailed discussion about your property.

PI003 **11/7/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Heidi Sheldon May

PI003-01 **Comment:**

I would like to know what is happening with the property directly across the street from my house. It was owned by The Elkins Family and now It has a sign saying highway construction will be taking place. I do understand that the Elkins family sold this to



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

INDOT but we were told it would be left as green space. All we are hearing are rumors. No direct information has come from the government or the Elkins family and we would simply appreciate the information. Right now all we have is a vague sign. Thank you in advance for your response.

Response:

The property in question on Fluck Mill Road is being reforested as part of the I-69 Section 4 habitat mitigation plan. There will be no roadway construction in this area associated with I-69.

PI004 **11/8/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)**
William Cuttill

PI004-01 **Comment:**

I wish to support the decision to NOT have Yonkers Street enter onto Tapp Road as designed in the Preferred Plan, but rather dead-end the street with a cul-de-sac.

I anticipate that there will be a great number of residents who will not be pleased by this proposal. I need to note that where my house is situated I will be most effect by the distance I will drive than any other individual in the subdivision. And strongly support the proposal for reasons of traffic safety.

Let me explain that I have lived at 2812 S. Yonkers St. for more than 30 years. During these years I have witnessed many, many accidents with traffic both entering onto Tapp Rd. and vehicles turning onto Yonkers from Tapp. The poor visibility of east bound traffic on Tapp accounts for most of these accidents and many more near misses. Unless an east bound driver anticipates, as they clear the top of the hill, traffic entering onto Tapp or driver turning onto Yonkers from Tapp, there is a severe risk of a collision.

In the winter this is even more of a problem, for slick makes avoiding a collision at the bottom of the hill on Tapp is a real challenge. It is not infrequent to see drivers sliding into yards and around other drivers to avoid a collision.

Also it is not uncommon for drivers to do really dumb things, like turning onto Yonkers only to back, back onto Tapp to change direction onto Tapp. When I see these folks I immediately say a prayer!!! When the overpass over I-69 is built this visibility problem will be increased and the additional volume coupled with the likelihood that drivers will probably be driving at speeds above the speed limit will only increase the dangers of this situation and possibly the severity of the accident. Already, the Tapp/Yonkers intersection has a high number of collisions, with the new road this number will only go up!!!!!!

Please eliminate this situation by building the planned cul-de-sac and save a life or two or three ---



Response:

Comment noted. Cul-de-sac of Yonkers Drive at Tapp Road is included in the Refined Preferred Alternative.

PI005 **11/14/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Jason R. Neal

PI005-01 **Comment:**

I live near where you are building the Chambers Pike overpass. On your maps my home is in the blue area. I would like for you to buy my house because I do not want to live that close to an interstate!!

Response:

The referenced property is identified as a potential displacement for the Refined Preferred Alternative. However, please note that the final determinations about access, including which properties are acquired, will take place as part of the final design process. You may reach us in the Section 5 Project Office at 3802 Industrial Blvd., Unit 2, Bloomington, IN 47403 (812-355-1390) for a more detailed discussion about your property.

PI006 **11/14/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Adam Wason

PI006-01 **Comment:**

Requesting a kitchen table meeting at the earliest possible time. We have a desire to figure out school districts for a son entering high school.

Response: Mary Jo

Please refer to PI005-01 response. Mr. Wason was contacted by phone regarding this matter.

PI007 **10/31/2012 Verbal - Office Visit / Phone Call Report**
Bob Sturgis, Sturgis Garage

PI007-01 **Comment:**

Comment documented in phone call report 10/31/2012: His concern includes what impacts will be made to his property and he does not want his street to become a dead end street. He expressed special relocation needs related to his business operations.

Response:

Please refer to PI086-01 response.



PI008 **11/14/2012 E-mail (Project Office)**
Steve Dawson, President, HFI Mechanical Contractors

PI008-01 **Comment:**

Marilyn Skirvin with the BEDC forwarded your contact information to me and stated that you wish to help BEDC members with I69 issues. First of all, thank you for working to help with this process. We are completely supportive of I69. However we do have three concerns that perhaps you can help us better understand.

The main concern is access to I69 / SR 37 from Vernal Pike. Our business, Harrell-Fish Inc, is located at 2010 West Vernal Pike and we now have direct access to IN SR 37. The nature of our business requires highway access with considerable load height clearance as well (for underpasses / overpasses). We have 75 fleet vehicles of our own and we receive shipments daily from as many as 20 carriers. Many of these carriers are 18 wheelers and some are flat beds with equipment hauled on them.

It is essential that these trucks be able to get in and out of our facility.

Response:

As discussed in meeting held on January 29, 2013 with HFI, turning radii for truck routes associated with Vernal Pike/17th Street, Curry Pike, and SR 48 will be designed to accommodate 18 wheel trucks.

PI008-02 **Comment:**

Second, depending on the route we must take in the future to gain highway access, we could lose productivity as our fleet (and drivers which are paid hourly) will incur increased cost to conduct business if our route to I69 / SR 37 takes longer than our current access route. Is there any compensation available to our business to offset this negative impact?

Response:

While compensation for modified access to the highway will not be available, the purpose of I-69, as defined in the Tier 1 FEIS, is to provide improved transportation linkages between Evansville and Indianapolis. The project will significantly improve regional travel and accessibility for Southwest Indiana residents and businesses. This regional improvement in transportation accessibility is likely to provide an overall net decrease in travel times for your fleet drivers traveling beyond the immediate local area.

PI008-03 **Comment:**

Last, depending on how West Vernal Pike is configured in the future, is it possible that West Vernal Pike might dead end without direct access to I69 / SR 37? If this occurs, our property may become less attractive, less valuable, and potentially might see more crime or vandalism from loss of use. Do you know what the plan is for West Vernal Pike?



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Is there any compensation available to us for the loss of property value if West Vernal Pike loses access?

For your convenience I have attached a map showing our property location for 2010 West Vernal Pike.

Any help or insight you have on these subjects would be greatly appreciated. Feel free to reply by email or call me at 812-339-2579.

[11/15/2012 Followup e-mail]

Map attachment showing our property.

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for copy of map.]

Response:

Changes in travel patterns are addressed in Section 5.3.4, *Travel Patterns and Accessibility*. Access to I-69 is provided at the SR-48 interchange. A cul-de-sac is proposed for West Vernal Pike east of I-69. INDOT cannot offer any insight as to the effects upon property values resulting from the change in access.

PI009 **12/18/2012 Phone (Project Office) /Meeting**
Johnny Wright /Waneeta Herrington

PI009-01 **Comment:**

[Summary of Meeting with Waneeta Herrington (resident and mother of Property Owner Johnny Wright); Mr. Herrington; and David Miller / Michael Baker]

Mr. Johnny Wright called the Project Office and requested that someone go out to meet with his mother at her residence. David Miller scheduled an appointment and went to discuss the project with Mrs. Herrington. She had concerns as to how the project would affect her property.

Mr. Miller showed her the map for her area and discussed the project. He pointed out that the current map did not show a potential displacement or partial taking. He also discussed the final design process.

Mrs. Herrington expressed her satisfaction with the meeting and the information presented.

Response:

As explained at the meeting, property acquisition at this location is not anticipated. Displacements and right-of-way purchases will be finalized in design.



PI010 **11/18/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Jessica Newsome-Head

PI010-01 **Comment:**

I own a house that backs up to highway 37 in section 5 how would I go about finding out if my family will be displaced by I69?

Response:

Please refer to PI024-01 response.

PI011 **11/19/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Jay Hall

PI011-01 **Comment:**

In regards to the proposed diamond interchange between Highway 45 & Tapp Road:

I've lived in Leonard Springs Addition for nearly 50 years. If an access road is built, it should be on the east side of I-69/37. This would be less expensive than relocating homes and moving power/gas lines on the west side. I know the Wapehani area very well. An access road bordering SR 37 would mean draining the lake which is an eyesore. It could mean another-better-entrance for the bike path and beautifying the area with other paths & ponds.

An access road on the west side of the interstate would be more costly. It would add more noise to and take away from the serenity of our neighborhood. The neighborhood has suffered enough with Wal-Mart traffic & the loss of Grandview School as well as tornados two years ago. We don't need an access road disrupting our lives. On the east side, the access road could help and otherwise unsightly portion of land.

Response:

No "access road" as such is anticipated on either side of the I-69 project at this location. The actual footprint of I-69 includes collector/distribution lanes and interchange ramps for the Tapp Rd./2nd Street split interchange on the outside of the through travel lanes at this location. The Refined Preferred Alternative provides for use of some of the property in Wapehani Mountain Bike Park and has fewer impacts west of I-69 than was shown in the DEIS Preferred Alternative 8. Measures to offset impacts are outlined in the MOA between FHWA, INDOT and the City of Bloomington (see FEIS Appendix QQ, Wapehani Memorandum of Agreement).



PI012 **11/20/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Daniel A. Alexander

PI012-01 **Comment:**

INDOT:

After reviewing ALT 8, I am hopeful that I will not have to relocate. My neighbors at 3701, 3703 & 3707 feel the same way. We purchased our homes new in 1997 & 1998 and have all remained here since, despite the excessive highway noise. It is a convenient location for us to access Westside Shopping and errands.

Now, the concern is more noise if the exit lane is built (as proposed) closer to our backyards. I feel, (as do my neighbors) some sort of raised sound barrier would be appropriate to control some of the highway exit ramp noise. I feel noise control is needed for several houses along Judd Ave, and maybe into Woodhaven Drive. Don't get me wrong, I am very appreciative that you will (as proposed) spare our homes from demolition and let us continue to live here. It would be nice to have the road noise reduced along our part of the 37 S - Fullerton Pike exit ramp and 37 (to be I-69) in general.

Response:

A preliminary noise barrier was found to be both reasonable and feasible according to the INDOT *Traffic Noise Analysis Procedure* manual for residences on the west side of I-69 in this area. Barrier lengths, heights, and offsets are analyzed in detail as part of the FEIS. The final decision as to whether to provide a noise barrier at this location will be made in design.

PI013 **11/21/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Dawn Hewitt

PI013-01 **Comment:**

There seems to be an error on a map in Chapter 5.3, page 160, of Alt. 8, subsection 5C. It shows an overpass connecting Vernal Pike east and west of the highway. The text of the document indicates closure for Vernal Pike, and an overpass connecting West 17th Street to Vernal west of the highway. The map shows a green line connecting West 17th to Vernal, but no asterisks indicating an overpass.

Response:

INDOT provided an email response with an explanation of the proposal and noted that graphics were updated for the public hearing. The DEIS Figures 5.2-5 to 5.2-9 at the Vernal Pike/17th St are change to be clearer in the FEIS. Cross-connectivity is portrayed the same way in each of the five alternatives. In the FEIS Refined Preferred Alternative, an overpass provides an east-west grade separation approximately 1400 feet north of



the existing Vernal Pike/SR 37 intersection. It will connect Vernal Pike on the west and 17th St. on the east.

PI014 **11/23/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Jason Neal

PI014-01 **Comment:**

My family and I moved to 831 E Chambers Pike in 2000...It seems that as soon as we moved in we heard that I 69 would be coming thru our area and given that our home is so close to SR-37 there would be no way to expand the highway to interstate standards with out taking our home. We have lived with this threat for going on 13 years and we would like for it to be over...i have seen the maps for section 5 and the proposed and preferred number 8 for the section. My home is in the light blue with dots on my home and garage with very little of my yard showing in the clear. My family ask that you purchase our home for 2 reasons..1 we do not want to live that close to an interstate....2 we feel that we have waited long enough and would like to start over in a different home as soon as we can to create some memories before my kids leave our home as adults.

Response:

Please refer to PI005-01 response.

PI015 **11/25/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Brent DeMoss

PI015-01 **Comment:**

I am looking for any information regarding the purchase of my property. I know that there is a frontage road proposed that appears to be planned through my living room. I imagine that no decisions have been finalized but would like any information that is available as to plans for my area and how the purchase process actually works.

Response:

Please refer to PI005-01 response.

PI016 **11/25/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Eric McNamara

PI016-01 **Comment:**

Hello, I was curious about what would become of the houses that the I-69 project has taken. Some of these houses are very new and have salvageable materials. Is there any information if salvaging would be possible before demo?



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Response:

The disposition of property purchased by INDOT as part of this project has not yet been determined. INDOT may be contacted regarding this issue at such time as construction contracts are awarded.

PI017 **11/27/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Chad Armstrong

PI017-01 **Comment:**

Hello, I keep hearing about i69 plans, I heard that some were posted in the HT, though I have not been able to locate what the plans are, particularly with what is planned for section 5 of i69 in relation to Kinser Pike. I heard that for Kinser Pike there will be a bridge that crosses i69. What is the plan for that? Are there maps/pictures that show the intended plan? Where can I find them?

Response:

Figure 3-13 of the FEIS shows the Refined Preferred Alternative, which has a grade separation at Kinser Pike, connecting it across I-69.

PI018 **11/27/2012 Comment Form - Mailed to Project Office**
Larry Drake, C&H Stone

PI018-01 **Comment:**

We have concerns about how tractor/trailers will be able to access our business during construction of the road and interchange -- BG Hoadley Quarries will also be affected.

Response:

INDOT requires construction contractors to maintain access to local businesses during construction.

PI019 **12/3/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Jan Lamm

PI019-01 **Comment:**

Good Morning, I own a home on Yonkers not far from Tapp Rd and Highway 37 3001 S Yonkers Ct, Bloomington, IN 47403 Can you tell me please how it will be affected?

Response:

Please refer to PI005-01 response.



PI020 **11/5/2012 Comment-Project Office Sign-In Sheet**
Gregory Chance

PI020-01 **Comment:**

Take the house, slow down traffic.

Response:

Comment noted; please refer to PI005-01 response.

PI021 **11/28/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Rachel Rice

PI021-01 **Comment:**

Is there a location or website where there is information about the construction of fueling stations/hotels/restaurants/etc that may be done anywhere along the new I-69 projects?

Response:

INDOT provided an e-mail response explaining that there is no source for this information. INDOT recommended contacting the Chambers of Commerce in each of the counties. Business locations are built and provided by private entities, subject to applicable land use and zoning provisions.

PI022 **12/2/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Jerry Rice

PI022-01 **Comment:**

I own property at 3709 S. Judd Avenue, Bloomington, Indiana 47403. Can you please tell me if the I-69 project or related DOT projects will affect this property in any way?

Response:

Please refer to PI005-01 response. Mr. Rice was also provided an e-mail regarding information available at the public hearing and on the I-69 website.

PI023 **11/28/2012 Comment-Project Office Sign-In Sheet**
Jim & Elizabeth Sindere

PI023-01 **Comment:**

Please - take my properties.



Response:

Please refer to PI005-01 response.

PI024 **11/28/2012 Comment-Project Office Guest Book**
A. Wayne & Melba Aynes

PI024-01 **Comment:**

Please buy this property.

Response:

The identified property is not identified as a potential displacement according to the FEIS analysis. Displacements and right-of-way purchases will be finalized in design. You may reach us in the Section 5 Project Office at 3802 Industrial Blvd., Unit 2, Bloomington, IN 47403 (812-355-1390) for more detailed discussion about your property.

PI025 **11/28/2012 Project Office Guest Book**
Anthony R Catozzi

Comment:

Concerns of Monroe Medical Arts at Fullerton Pike.

Response:

Concerns noted in the verbal discussion with I-69 Section 5 Project Office staff pertained to business displacements in the Monroe Medical Arts Building. Please refer to PI062-01 response for changes incorporated into the Refined Preferred Alternative at this location that reduce impacts to these businesses.

PI026 **11/29/2012 Comment-Project Office Guest Book**
Dave Devitt

PI026-01 **Comment:**

Permit IDEM Environmental Management-(Transfer Station) East Vernal Pike truck traffic on Crescent Rd to new overpass. [Based on verbal discussion, comment is regarding potential for development of a transfer station along East Vernal Pike, truck traffic on Vernal Pike would use Crescent Road to access new overpass.]

Response:

Comment noted. Response to specific comments provided in PO002-01 and PO002-05.



PI027 **11/16/2012 Comment-Project Office Guest Book**
Nancy Rice

PI027-01 **Comment:**

(Referring to proposed entrance to Hickory Heights Mobile Home Park) The plans will put more traffic through our small neighborhood which doesn't have sidewalks.

Response:

The Hickory Heights Mobile Home Park currently has access from Tapp Road via Barger Lane. With Alternative 8, access to the mobile home park was to connect onto West Maple Leaf Drive, through neighborhoods north of the mobile home park. With the Refined Preferred Alternative 8, access has been revised to tie into South Danlyn Road to the west of the mobile home park, to provide for shorter access between Tapp Road and the mobile home park and reduce the change to existing access. This revision reduces the distance of travel through neighborhoods in order to access I-69.

PI028 **11/14/2012 Comment-Project Office Guest Book**
Jason Neal

PI028-01 **Comment:**

I live at 831 E Chambers Pike Bloomington, IN 47408. Buy my house! I do not want to live that close to an interstate!!!

Response:

Please refer to PI005-01 response.

PI029 **12/3/2012 Comment-Project Office Guest Book**
Gregory Chance

PI029-01 **Comment:**

I think it would be wise to take house for more flexibility, in your efforts towards your goals and safety.

Response:

Please refer to PI005-01 response.

PI030 **12/6/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Gary Moody

PI030-01 **Comment:**

I'm looking at your web site, obviously. Why is there no link to public hearing schedule or announcements?



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Response:

An e-mail response was sent to provide information about the public hearing. The I-69 website was also modified to make this information easier to find.

PI031 **12/7/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Lance Deaton

PI031-01 **Comment:**

People have stood against progress for the past couple of centuries in this country, to no avail. Don't let the vocal minority influence your decision making. This road must be built. We must finish what we start now. Get a plan together and execute it. Whatever you do, get this done sooner rather than later.

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to AF002-23 response.

PI032 **12/8/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Adam Heichelbech

PI032-01 **Comment:**

The overall tone of the the DEIS seems to show a desire for minimal impact and lowest cost options, while maintaining safety. Each of these things can be accomplished in conjunction with each other and the preferred alternative 8 seems to accomplish all three things as well. I concur with other comments made that as I69 has been constructed very close to Monroe County, that there be a deliberate move by Indiana to see the project is completed through section 5 as quickly and safely as possible.

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to AF002-23 response.

PI032-02 **Comment:**

Tapp Road - I would prefer to keep I69 aligned with the current IN37 lanes without shifting to the west to avoid Wapehani Mountain Bike Park. This may cost less but there needs to be a guarantee that the interchange lanes running along the west side of the park will be separated by 12 FT concrete barriers to ensure pedestrian separation, reduce noise in the natural area and create a visual obstruction of the roads from the park.

Response:

Please refer to PI011-01 response.



PI032-03 **Comment:**

45/2ND ST - The interchange at 45/2ND ST is concerning in how access to Sam's Club will change. The interchange lanes will displace the current Sam's Club Main Entrance. INDOT needs to consider the impacts this will create at the intersection to the west at the Liberty Drive more carefully as traffic will increase on Hickory Leaf Drive to access the Sam's Club's west entrance.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-03 response.

PI032-04 **Comment:**

Vernal Pike/17TH ST - The proposed 17TH ST overpass sounds more economical than an overpass at Vernal Pike but the lack of direct access at this point severely limits access to/from the State Police Post.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-07 response. Access to the State Police Post will continue to be available from SR 46 and local connecting roads.

PI032-05 **Comment:**

Walnut ST - I strongly support the Option B interchange because of the substantially lower cost and minimized impact to this sensitive area. All construction completed in the are[a] of that interchange is important floodplain. A full interchange would result in significant loss of floodplain. Option A would bring an urbanized feel to the area and provide an promote long term growth into sensitive natural areas. Option A displaces more prime farmland and important forested bottomland, which is prime habitat for the Indiana brown bat and other bat species in the area. There are more than enough full interchanges for Bloomington in the current plans. I don't see the current two lanes of Walnut Street being able to sustain the amount of increased traffic resulting from a full interchange. A partial interchange will serve Bloomington well. Build it at the lower cost now, it could always be upgraded in the future!

Response:

Please refer to AF002-46 response.

PI032-06 **Comment:**

Ellis RD - As I live in the Showers neighborhood, I'm pleased to see the local access road kept as close to the I69 route as possible. The stretch along the Hoosier Energy Head Quarters will be narrow, I suggest that barriers be used between the local access road and the interstate.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Response:

The Refined Preferred Alternative includes barrier separation at this location. Also refer to AF002-02 response in regards to proposed changes to the east side access road south of Hoosier Energy.

PI032-07

Comment:

Wayport Neighborhood - At the point where the East side local access road intersects the southern point of the Wayport neighborhood lane, I propose that the local access road follow the Wayport neighborhood lane route. This would avoid the displacement of 3 properties by using existing routes.

Response:

The Refined Preferred Alternative includes a shift in the location of the east side access road to follow Wayport Road; however, the alignment does not follow Wayport neighborhood lane as suggested in this comment because of requirements for horizontal curves, minimizing impacts to nearby karst features, and the need to provide access to remaining business (BP).

PI033

**12/9/2012 E-mail (I-69)
Marty Wyatt**

PI033-01

Comment:

With In. 37 and I-69 running on the same route, only 4 lanes will not handle the new amount of traffic.

Response:

Updated traffic forecasts are provided in the FEIS (see Section 5.6, *Traffic Impacts*, and Appendix SS, *Traffic Simulation Modeling Summary*). The proposed typical section of I-69 in the Refined Preferred Alternative is expected to allow the I-69 mainline to operate at an acceptable level of service with minimal to no delay for vehicles in 2035. This includes three travel lanes in each direction between Sample Road and the SR 37 interchange at the south end of Section 5.

PI034

**12/6/2012 E-mail (Baker)
Jan Lamm**

PI034-01

Comment:

My husband and I both work this evening and will be unable to attend. Is there any where on the Internet to see the maps?



Response:

E-mail response provided links for Public Hearing materials available from the I-69 Section 5 website. Refer to <http://www.i69indyevn.org/section-5/>, look for reference to the “Presentation Materials & Maps” then “DEIS Public Hearing” – the map links are available in the last bullet.

PI034-02 Comment:

12/8/2012 Followup e-mail:

Thank you for the map links. Looks like change is in our future. Do you have a projection time frame for the Design Phase?

Response:

Please refer to PI005-01 and AF002-23 responses.

**PI035 12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)
Joe Barker**

PI035-01 Comment:

I am pleased you are putting an interchange at Liberty Church and Godsey Roads. Thank You!!!

Response:

Comment noted.

**PI036 12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)
Jim Shelton**

PI036-01 Comment:

It is important to the IU Health Bloomington that the proposed Tapp Rd. interchange or it’s equivalent be implemented to provide access to the Southern Indiana Medical Center including the Cancer Prevention Center and the new Hospice.

Response:

The Refined Preferred Alternative includes the Tapp Road/2nd Street interchange.

**PI037 12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)
Sheryl Peoples**

PI037-01 Comment:

Sample Road, and south



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

There is a series of 7 houses (families) to be displaced from the east side, from Wylie Rd. north. (Purcell Rd)

Installing the local access road will require removing the top of that ridge. This will result, with the additional truck traffic—down shifting as they go up the hill—in a significant increase in noise for the residents on both sides of Wylie Rd. This is currently a very quiet area.

I request:

- 1) minimizing the grading of the ridge
- 2) a permanent sound barrier be installed
- 3) at minimum, the planting of trees & other plants where the houses currently are located to serve as a minimal sound barrier.

Response:

- 1) The grade of the access road will be determined in final design.
- 2) The Highway Traffic Noise Analysis was performed in accordance with the INDOT *Traffic Noise Analysis Procedure*. The preliminary analysis provided a comprehensive description and evaluation of the existing noise levels, the design year 2035 No-Build noise levels, and the design year 2035 noise levels for the Build Alternatives, as well as a detailed Highway Noise Mitigation Assessment for the design year 2035 traffic noise impacts for the Build Alternatives. In this area, there were no predicted impacts. If the results of the FEIS indicate noise impacts according to INDOT policy, then highway traffic noise abatement measures are evaluated to include traffic management measures, alteration of horizontal and vertical alignments, acquisition of buffering land, noise insulation of public use or nonprofit institutional structures, and/or construction of traffic noise barriers. Highway traffic noise abatement will be provided in areas where the evaluated traffic noise abatement measures meet the criteria to be considered both “reasonable” and “feasible.”
- 3) Landscaping will not be evaluated since FHWA does not consider landscaping as a viable noise abatement measure (“Highway Traffic Noise: Analysis and Abatement Guidance”, prepared by FHWA, dated June 2010).

PI037-02

Comment:

Of the Walnut St. options, I prefer Option A - full interchange. Without it, traffic on Walnut will be increased because there is no other route south except Walnut from the east frontage Rd vehicles.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-46 response.



PI037-03 Comment:

This packet, page 7, Subsection 5D is inconsistent with the map from Ellis to Sample Rd. (sheet 8 of 16).

The map shows new access roads on both sides. Page 7 says the east access road comes from the existing north bound lanes.

Response:

The shift begins north of Griffith Cemetery. The referenced description (included on page 7 of the Public Hearing handout) provided a more general description.

PI037-04 Comment:

What will be done to improve Old SR 37? It will triple in traffic load and it is already a risky road to drive—high speeds, hills, curves, blind intersections, bus stops.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-08 response.

**PI038 12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)
Will Graham**

PI038-01 Comment:

Good gracious! Two lanes each direction from the top of the hill north of Bloomington to Martinsville? Till 2035!

I can just imagine coming down 69 to the North Walnut intersection seeing three lanes of headlights from horizon to horizon, same as any other major North/South interstate in this country.

It does give the impression that the state is proposing to do a bit of shoulder work and close off all crosstown traffic, then dumping traffic from the new 69 onto existing 37—about all they can afford at this time—a selfless example of [illegible] capitalism caught in self-justification pattern. Where did you find those yahoos at Michael Baker's? Too much to think about, presented in broken down bytes and bits of information but actually scant on details, such as exactly how the territory will lay when a new access exchange will be built along the route, or how an existing exchange will tie into the proposed super highway.

Response:

Please refer to PI033-01 response. In addition, the traffic forecasts documented in Section 5.6, *Traffic Impacts*, indicate that two lanes in each direction between Sample Road and Martinsville will adequately serve traffic through 2035 (the forecast year for



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

this project). The section of I-69 between Walnut Street and Martinsville will have significant improvements and reconstruction. See FEIS Sections 6.3.4.4 through 6.3.4.6 for descriptions of these improvements.

PI038-02 **Comment:**

I doubt seriously that any attention has been paid to the bridges along existing 37 and what would be required to upgrade to interstate standards.

Response:

Each of the existing SR-37 bridges have been reviewed. The necessary rehabilitation or reconstruction to bring them to interstate standards is reflected in the costs and impacts provided for each alternative.

PI039 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Tim Kinder

PI039-01 **Comment:**

- 1) With closing Judd Ave., has consideration been given to the detoured traffic to Sharon Dr. and Sim Dr.? The traffic could potentially start using Sharon and/or Sim, especially for residents of Garden Acres and Woodhaven Estates. Any plan for improving those local access roads, especially given that there will be an interchange at Fullerton?

Response:

No improvements are proposed for Sharon Drive or Sim Drive as part of the I-69 project.

PI039-02 **Comment:**

- 2) The intersection of Fullerton Pike and Leonard Springs desperately needs improvement because the intersection is on a curve. This will exacerbate w/the increased traffic at the Fullerton interchange. Please improve the Fullerton and Leonard Springs intersection.

Response:

No improvements are proposed for this intersection as part of the I-69 project; this intersection is outside of the project area.

PI040 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Matt Wyass, Broker Association
F.C. Tucker/Bloomington, Realtors

PI040-01 **Comment:**

Tapp Rd/2nd Street



Alternative 7 vs Alternative 8

THOUGHTS...

- Alternative 7 is much more “cost effective”
- Less homeowners on Yonkers EFFECTED
- Still preserves Wapehani Mtn Park (Bike) & yet leaves “OPPORTUNITY 2 ENHANCE” park as it exists now
- Spend more on a “GREAT BARRIER” to reduce noise and save on the long run....hence (no Alt 8)
- Cost reduction = 2nd St place bridge stay in take for future utilization
- Less intervening of current home owners in Van Buren Park!

Response:

Please refer to PI011-01 responses.

PI041 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Mike Kiser, Owner, Chapman Lake Instrument

PI041-01 **Comment:**

I own a business (Chapman Lake Instrument) that is located at 2115 Industrial Drive. With the proposed changes to Vernal Pike, our access to 37/69 is going to be much more complicated. Ours is a dead end street so we can exit and enter at the north end only. With the loss of the intersection of Vernal Pike and 37, our only alternatives will require several miles of extra driving.

What I would like to see is a connection between what is now the cul-de-sac of Industrial Drive and the streets of the shopping center on the other side of the railroad tracks. This would be a huge help to me, as well as the numerous other businesses on Industrial Drive.

I understand that the railroad is challenging to deal with regarding new crossings, but the rail traffic here is very slow and is only used for moving railcars in & out of storage. A switchyard of sorts.

Surely money could be made available to help us avoid the isolation that the proposed plan will cause.

Response:

The improvement described is not part of this project. This connection is a separate project in the current Bloomington-Monroe County MPO Long Range Plan.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

PI042 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Benny Jane Holt

PI042-01 **Comment:**

My husband and I retired here in 1998 but I attended Indiana University in the 1960s when there was only a 2-lane 37. It was awful and very dangerous so was glad to hear when they put a 4 lane 37 in. Since retiring here, I drive up to Indy a lot to see my children and I find 37 to still be dangerous. People drive too fast and there are so many places to enter 37 that are potential accident sites. I lived from 1964 to 1998 in northwest Indiana where I taught. In that time I 65 was built and in 1970 we built a home on a road that paralleled and was just west of I 65. My husband drove I 65 north to the steel mills to work. We never noticed any noise or we became very used to the traffic noise and it never bothered us. I really feel the good points of building I 69 from Evansville to Indy far outweigh the drawbacks.

Response:

Comment noted.

PI043 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Vincent Bruning, Lamar Advertising Indianapolis

PI043-01 **Comment:**

I am the Real Estate Manager for Lamar Advertising Indianapolis. We also have an sales & operations officer in Bloomington.

Would like to discuss the billboards Lamar owns that are in or near the proposed alternate rights of way. Especially Sample Road intersection.

By working with INDOT early in the process on the I-465 West project, we were able to save both company and state from marginal ROW acquisitions.

Look forward to talking to you soon.

Response:

A commitment to coordinate with outdoor advertising companies as part of early coordination activities in design has been added to Section 7.3.1, *Land Use*, Item 3.

PI044 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Meri Reinhold

PI044-01 **Comment:**

Stop it right where it is & leave Monroe County out of it. Use 231 to go North. It was a foolish idea from the start 25 years ago made even more foolish in light of modern day issues w/falling gas taxes & climate change.



Response:

The routing described in this comment was considered in the Tier 1 study as Alternative 4A. It was determined to be a non-preferred alternative in the Tier 1 DEIS due to its relatively poor performance on project goals. This non-preferred status also was retained in the Tier 1 FEIS; see Tier 1 FEIS, Section 6.2.2, *Alternatives Non-Preferred in DEIS for Performance Reasons*. Alternative 4A performed “high” on only one of nine Tier 1 project goals, and performed “low” on 4 of the 9 goals (See Tier 1 FEIS, Table 3-35). By comparison, the Tier 1 selected alternative, Alternative 3C, performed “high” on 8 of 9 Tier 1 goals, and performed “medium” on the 9th goal.

PI045 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Sara Sturgeon

PI045-01 **Comment:**

I would like to know if the overpass will effect my house. Will Rockport Road be made wider any farther than right at I-69.

Response:

Rockport Road will be upgraded and widened at the I-69 overpass northwest to its connection with Fullerton Pike. Please also refer to response PI024-01.

PI045-02 **Comment:**

My more important concern is for my parents home on Cooksey lane at the Morgan Monroe Co. line.

My parents and my grand parents have lived on that land for a very long time. How can you close their road and not give them an alternative road to get out to a main road such as Old State Rd 37. This makes no sense. How can it be cheaper to buy their land than it would be to build a short road out for them.

Response:

Please refer to PI085-01 response.

PI046 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Jennifer Miers

PI046-01 **Comment:**

I use Mt. Bike Park but please don't displace residences to save that narrow strip of the park.

Response:

Please refer to PI011-01 response.



PI046-02 Comment:

I appreciate the efforts to accommodate bikes & pedestrians seeking to cross 69/37. But as access roads are closed more traffic will be sent to remaining overpasses. This is a hostile environment for cyclists and walkers. The 2nd & 3rd Street overpasses are areas of great concern. Please consider a dedicated bike/pedestrian bridge between these streets as the safest option.

Response:

Bicycle and pedestrian concerns identified in DEIS comments have been further coordinated with INDOT and local agencies. Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations across I-69 are included at overpasses and interchanges within the limits of the I-69 Section 5 project. See Section 7.3.2, *Social and Neighborhood*, Table 7-2 for a listing of pedestrian and bicycle-related commitments included in the project. This includes multi-use (bicycle and pedestrian) paths at both the 2nd and 3rd Street interchanges. A dedicated bike/pedestrian bridge is not included as part of the Section 5 project.

PI046-03 Comment:

The Fullerton Interchange will devastate the neighborhood & Clear Creek Trail impacted by the county road improvement needed to connect to it.

Response:

The Fullerton Pike / Gordon Pike / Rhorer Road project under development by Monroe County is in the BMCMPPO's Long Range Plan; this project is not part of the Section 5 project. This local road project is being evaluated with a separate but coordinated environmental study. INDOT recently met with Monroe County on February 4, 2013 as part of the ongoing coordination between the two projects.

PI047 12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)
Melissa Schiff, Melissa A Schiff CPA PC
Hillview Motel Inc
Hunter Towing Inc
Hunter Storage
Schiff Properties LLC
Serious Sports Inc
Dreams in Motion Academy of Dance by Miranda
Brian's Off Road Inc
Plus multiple residential

PI047-01 Comment:

Give consideration for loss of business income not just raw property value

See comments on back



Consider if someone said we will pay for your computer, but nothing for work you can not do.

Over

Allocate funds to make advocates available to property owners who will be displaced—owners would be better served by knowledgeable resource individuals who were not “just part of project” but who were independent.

Schedule meetings with displaced business prior to acquisition process to add owners in expanding understanding of process prior to being in the middle of it—surely 32 is manable.

Response:

INDOT’s policies for relocations are governed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (“Uniform Act” – Public Law 91-646), as amended in 1987. INDOT will take required actions to ensure fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of this project. A relocation agent will be assigned to this project in advance of acquisition to ascertain the needs and desires of the potentially displaced persons to provide information, answer questions, and give help in finding replacement property.

While partial land acquisition is still needed for right-of-way, the Refined Preferred Alternative includes refinements that reduce business displacements and the businesses noted in this comment are no longer considered to be displaced. Displacements and right-of-way purchases will be finalized in design. You may reach us in the Section 5 Project Office at 3802 Industrial Blvd., Unit 2, Bloomington, IN 47403 (812-355-1390) for more detailed discussion about your properties.

PI047-02

Comment:

Notification needs to be improved—if a personal/phone is not feasible—at least a mailing.

Response:

The legal notice of public hearing and availability of the DEIS was published in the Bloomington Herald Times and the Martinsville Reporter Times on November 16, 21, and 30, 2012 and on December 3, 2012.

The project team maintains a mailing list of all property owners within the Study Corridor (pulled from the Morgan and Monroe County GIS databases), as well as individuals who have contacted the project office and requested inclusion on the list. All persons on the mailing list were provided with postcard notification of the Public Hearing approximately two weeks in advance of the meeting.

The DEIS was also published on the project website for public review and hard copies were made available at local libraries and at the project office.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Kitchen table meetings with potentially affected property owners were initiated in April 2013 and are on-going.

PI047-03 **Comment:**

Acquisition should not minimize needs related to acquiring new mortgages—perhaps getting assistance working with mortgage companies transferring debt to new property.

Response:

The Uniform Act and INDOT's policies do not provide for the kind of mortgage financing assistance described in this comment.

PI047-04 **Comment:**

Help offset damage to business that are not displaced but have access impacts—allowance for signage—state provided directional signage—keeping our access road parallel (next to) highway would help our clients/customers feel-perceive less inconvenienced.

Response:

INDOT will consider such signage in the context of its Indiana Tourist Oriented Directional Sign Policy. Such signage (if provided) will be considered in final design.

PI047-05 **Comment:**

Tolls would kill any of our businesses that survive the acquisition process.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-23 response.

PI048 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
David Griffith

PI048-01 **Comment:**

Let's move forward with finding money to build Section 5 of I-69. It should improve traffic flow, reduce accidents and allow more efficient travel. Big Ten Schools such as Indiana University, Michigan, and Michigan State Universities will benefit with a streamlined roadway. Perhaps some money could be utilized from the state surplus or earmarks could be obtain from Congress. Hopefully construction can start by 2015 before the costs increase.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-23 response.



PI049 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Todd J. Schnatzmeyer

PI049-01 **Comment:**

Per the "INDOT *Traffic Noise Analysis Procedure*" and policy effective July 13, 2011, there should be abatement noise measurements taken during the "worst noise impact" based on traffic volume in the project area. The Windsor Private community is acutely aware that the existing Highway I-37 corridor creates some perceptible noise in its existing state. I'm quite certain the traffic has increased over the last 20+ years this community has been in place, so we have likely already hit a "critical mass" in tolerance of this issue. We are primarily concerned with the potential for a noticeable increase in ambient noise as a direct-result the increased volume and surface of the new I-69 corridor as well as the construction activity required during its development. As tax payers and citizens of the State of Indiana we would expect the noise impact to be maintained to existing (or lower) levels, as this has a direct impact on our quiet enjoyment & quality of life, as well as property values in our community. Further, we anticipate the I-69 development project team will make a concerted effort to provide both; test results and mitigation plans for our review and kindly answer any pertinent questions we may have individually or through our Homeowner's Association.

Response:

Noise impacts under the INDOT *Traffic Noise Analysis Procedure* are defined as traffic noise levels which approach or exceed FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) for a particular activity category (which for residential land use is 67 decibels (dBA) or have predicted traffic noise levels substantially exceeding existing noise levels (defined as at least 15 dBA). For areas which are impacted, noise abatement measures can be considered where that abatement is anticipated to be both "feasible" and "reasonable".

The INDOT *Traffic Noise Analysis Procedure* discusses the feasibility and reasonable criteria that are used when determining whether noise abatement measures should be implemented. Noise barriers are considered acoustically "feasible" when the majority of the impacted receptors (over 50%) in the affected area receive a noise reduction of at least 5 dBA. In addition, it must also be "feasible" in terms of engineering and design, which takes into account topography, drainage, safety, barrier height, utilities, and access/maintenance needs (which may include right-of-way considerations). Reasonableness is based on three criteria: INDOT's design goal for noise abatement, cost-effectiveness, and consideration of view of residents and property owners. Barriers are considered "reasonable" when the INDOT design goal is met (7 dBA reduction for the majority [greater than 50%] of first row of impacted receptors), the cost per benefitted receptor is no more than \$30,000, and the viewpoints of the benefitted residents (homeowners and renters) are taken into account. See Section 5.10 for details about these determinations.

At this location, a noise barrier was determined to be acoustically "feasible," since it provided a necessary level of noise reduction. However, it was not "reasonable," since



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

the cost per benefitted receptor was greater than \$30,000. Accordingly, a noise barrier at this location is not planned.

PI050 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Raymond Saidah

PI050-01 **Comment:**

I own a property with my house on its southern part. The property is located west of 37, south of The Light Source. Having seen the latest designs of Section 5 of the proposed I-69, it seems that some of my property will be used for the new 2 lanes west of the actual highway.

I request that a sound barrier be built at the edge of the new I-69 as my house will be too close to it.

Response:

Please refer to PI037-01 response.

PI051 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Gary and Helen Davis

PI051-01 **Comment:**

We were on the I 69 from Evansville, IN. It is a very nice, “but”, you need Rest Areas. If you cannot stop, it is a very long way to go to the restrooms. Gas stations would also be nice & food areas. Someone might have trouble with their car also.

Response:

No rest areas are planned within the I-69 Section 5 project limits. The amenities described are found in the urbanized areas of Martinsville and Bloomington.

PI052 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Kevin and Jeanette McKnight

PI052-01 **Comment:**

We are concerned about the proposed approach to the bridge that will cross over I-69 at Rockport Rd. Traffic moves pretty fast past our house now with a stop sign, we can't imagine how fast traffic will be with the bridge in. Our main concern is pulling in and out of our driveway safely. We would like to not see the bridge from our home. We are concerned that it will affect our property value.

Response:

Posted speed limit of Rockport Road is 35 mph and will be 40 mph after construction of I-69, Section 5. The Rockport Road overpass will be designed according to the Indiana



Design Manual. INDOT cannot offer any insight as to the effects upon property values of this new overpass. Please refer to PI097-03 response in regards to visual impacts.

PI053 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Vern Timmer

PI053-01 **Comment:**

If Option B-sheet 7B of 16 – becomes or stays the partial interchang[e] for Walnut Street, then the 100± acres I own will not have immediate access. I own the property starting on Bottom Road. and where H. 37 meet going North between Bottom Road and H. 37. See map. With no exchanges on Bottom Road & Kinser Pike, the neares[t] exchange is Sample Road. If the road of Sample Road stops at Thompson Furniture, I still do not have access to my north-east corner of my property. Could Sample Road be extended further south so as to get to the corner of the North East property?

I understand the additional cost of Option A-Sheet 7A of 16.

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for copy of map.]

Response:

Access to this property will be maintained via other local roads connecting to Bottom Road.

PI054 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Elizabeth Venstra

PI054-01 **Comment:**

First- I don't believe this road will certainly be built. From what I have read, the necessary funding to complete the entire project has not been identified. And I don't believe it should be built. There is no need for an Interstate here, aside from the push for the entire NAFTA superhighway. Each section is supposed to have independent utility and this section doesn't. We already have perfectly adequate access to Indianapolis. Building I-69 will drain our state coffers, meaning that needed repairs to other roads—including many structurally deficient bridges—will be pushed aside for lack of funds. The whole project should be scrapped.

Response:

Sections 1 through 3 of I-69 are completed and open to traffic. Section 4 is under construction, and will be open to traffic by late 2014. The Section 5 environmental studies is concluded with a Record of Decision (ROD), which requires that INDOT demonstrates that it is fiscally-constrained. This will demonstrate that adequate funding exists to complete this project while addressing other transportation needs in Indiana.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

The Tier 1 FEIS and ROD determined that each Tier 2 section serves an independent transportation purpose; see Tier 1 ROD, Section 2.3.2, *Termini for Tier 2 Sections* and Tier 1 FEIS, Section 6.5.2, *Rationale for Tier 2 Termini*.

PI054-02 **Comment:**

That being said, if the road is ever built, it must have adequate accommodation for bicycle and pedestrian safety in crossing the highway at 2nd St. and 3rd St. These two major arteries of the city need to be able to accommodate all modes of traffic. Right now, both are quite dangerous. Both 2nd St. and 3rd St. need sidewalks—wide shoulders are not safe. I know 3rd St. is currently slated to use the existing bridge. I urge you to add sidewalks to this existing bridge, even if it is not replaced. We are approaching (if not have passed) peak oil, and non-car modes of transportation will become more important. Non-car modes are already very important to people who cannot afford to drive, which, with the current economy, are a lot of people.

Response:

Please refer to PI046-02 response.

PI054-03 **Comment:**

Also, I encourage you either to include the proposed bicycle bridge within the plans for the project, or to give all possible cooperation and encouragement to the building of this bridge by the City of Bloomington, as appropriate. We need a safe way for cyclists to cross the road, especially those who might not be bold enough to ride in traffic alongside many cars on busy roads like 2nd and 3rd.

Truthfully, both of these accommodations—sidewalks and the bicycle bridge—are needed regardless of whether the highway becomes I-69, or remains SR 37. The biggest transportation need in Indiana is greater facilities for cyclists, pedestrians, and transit users and INDOT would be serving us best if it built sidewalk and scrapped I-69.

Response:

Please refer to PI046-02 response.

PI055 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Dennis Reeves

PI055-01 **Comment:**

Our road needs to be maintained. Bridges need to be added to the 2 creeks we will have to cross to get out. There is a bus that comes down our road and it needs to be able to pick children up safely. Road needs raised between 1331 E. Bryants Ck & 1620 E. Bryants Creek.

When water comes up road floods.



Response:

Flooding is an existing condition that occurs in this area prior to reaching SR-37. Please also refer to LG010-65(h.) response.

PI056 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Lisa Pankiewicz

PI056-01 **Comment:**

Our access is being cut off to the west. We are frequently unable to get out going east because our road floods in two places, Will bridges be built to cross the creeks? If not, we will frequently be trapped and unable to get to work, school, the grocery store, the doctor's office, etc. Huge concern here. My neighbor has medical problems. What if she needs EMS?

Response:

Please refer to PI055-01 response.

PI057 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Terry Max and Karen Dick

PI057-01 **Comment:**

Could the interchange for Fullerton Pike be moved south of Monroe Hospital and use open fields on both east and west side of 37 instead of eliminating all the existing business? The new road could tie into the existing hospital & Fullerton, saving millions of dollars.

Response:

The selected interchange location minimizes costs and impacts to resources. There are significant karst features in this area which are avoided by keeping the alignment on existing Fullerton Pike. In addition, such a significant detour in the alignment of existing Fullerton Pike would significantly increase the travel time for those traveling through this area on Fullerton Pike.

PI058 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Pam Puett

PI058-01 **Comment:**

We have concerns because we cannot get out of our road heading east, which is the way we will have to go when I-69 is up & running due to having to cross 2 creeks without any bridges or maintenance. I have 2 sons that ride the school bus and the school bus will not cross the creeks. My kids need a safe bus stop. Bus stop now is at our house, my children can't cross 2 creeks to get to bus.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

We need bridges or something for our road to make it safe to go that way.

The road needs to be maintained please! If it floods at all right now fire department and EMS can't get into our road except Hwy 37 side.

Response:

Please refer to PI055-01 response.

PI059 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
No Name Provided

PI059-01 **Comment:**

I live on Jordan Ct. & am inquiring about sound barrier positive or negative to install one. Noise level and property value across from church.

Response:

A preliminary noise barrier was found to be both reasonable and feasible according to the INDOT *Traffic Noise Analysis Procedure* manual for residences in the northwest quadrant of the I-69/Fullerton Pike interchange. Barrier lengths, heights, and offsets are analyzed in detail as part of the FEIS. Barrier reasonableness and feasibility were also updated for this process. The decision whether to provide a noise barrier will be finalized in design.

PI060 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
Charles Langley

PI060-01 **Comment:**

I am interested in how the noise level can be reduced to a minimum.

- A. The finish of the surface
- B. Type of surface—conc[rete] or asphalt (prefer asphalt)
- C. Elevations over Rockport in ref. to homes.

Response:

The finish/surface of the roadway material will be determined in final design. In many situations, the contractor is given an option for both concrete and asphalt and decisions are based on a life-cycle cost analysis. The elevation of the roadway in the area of Rockport Road will be determined by the vertical clearance required over I-69.



PI061 **12/6/2012 Comment Form (Public Hearing)**
David Jent

PI061-01 **Comment:**

On the section between Sample & Simpson Chap. Road think about lowering the new road, leaving the north bound 37 lane at the existing level. This creates a natural sound berm for Windsor Private (where I live). Also Oliver Winery, Worm's Way and for additional future users of property on this side of the road. This also allows for shallower grades on either side of this section.

If not this the residents of Windsor Private feel the sound from the new road will degrade the value of our property & quality of life.

Response:

The profile of the roadway is planned to be at the existing roadway elevation, or slightly higher, since the Refined Preferred Alternative makes use of the existing roadbed. In the area adjacent to Windsor Private, the mainline I-69 pavement will be shifted west of the existing SR 37, utilizing existing northbound SR 37 pavement as the east-side access road. Please refer to PI037-01 and PI049-01 responses for discussion of noise impacts at this location.

PI062 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Phone)**
Frank Young

PI062-01 **Comment:**

He has not been contacted by anyone about I-69 taking his property but according to the "paper" he would be impacted.

Response:

Based on phone discussion, this business is located in the Monroe Medical Arts Building. Mr. Young was referred to the maps available on the website and was encouraged to stop by the Project Office to view them since he was unable to attend the public hearing.

As part of the Refined Preferred Alternative, the alignment to connect to West Fullerton Pike was shifted north to reduce business impacts at this location. FEIS Section 7.3.2, *Social and Neighborhood*, notes that specific engineered solutions are needed to avoid the relocation of the Monroe Hospital Administration and Billing building. While land is still anticipated to be needed, the impacts to this property are reduced and displacements are not anticipated with the Refined Preferred Alternative. Final decisions about property acquisition will be made in the design phase.

PI063 **COMMENT NUMBER NOT USED**



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

PI064 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Jim Murphy

PI064-01 **Comment:**

Thank you. There are many things to consider with this highway. I'm a supporter of Section 5 of I-69. The number one thing that comes to my mind is safety. Twenty-three years ago this month, tragedy struck my family, automobile accident that killed my mother, sister, and brother-in-law. My one-year-old nephew survived. The driver of that vehicle that hit them was from Evansville, Indiana. If this highway was built then, he would not be on these small, narrow roads. My family would be here today. So safety has been mentioned several times. This is of the utmost importance.

Response:

Comment noted.

PI064-02 **Comment:**

This is not a new terrain highway. We're using existing infrastructure, so it lessens the burden. However, there is burden on private property, but it's minimal. I have a few concerns myself of which I will send you those concerns and my suggestions, recommendation.

Response:

Comment noted.

PI064-03 **Comment:**

I-69 is coming. There are people that are still debating and trying to stop this, but it's obvious that just a few miles southwest of here, a quarter mile from my father's land in Greene County, but that's okay because it's better access for him to get to Bloomington. This will create construction jobs and enhance long-term jobs and economic development, and in this economy and in these times and with the uncertain future that's a positive thing for us all.

I'm hopeful that Monroe County, the representatives of Monroe County, will step forward and work with you so that we all can benefit from this highway and not work against you. They represent us, and we need to have the best possible infrastructure in place so we can all benefit from it. Thank you.

Response:

Comment noted. Monroe County is working with INDOT as a Participating Agency for this study.



PI065 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
David Griffith

PI065-01 **Comment:**

Hello. Glad to come out tonight and show support for I-69. I live in an area that's been forgotten about for decades in Evansville, and tonight I made it in less than two hours between Evansville to Bloomington. I mean, that's phenomenal, and it's going to get even better. We're talking about 105 miles. And it's good for the communities, Washington, Petersburg, those communities, just that area.

It's easy to get to Chicago. We've got U.S. 41 for that. That's what it was designed for in the first place. It was never really, you know, -- really made for Indianapolis to get to Evansville. And 41 is a great highway, and it goes through eight states, the major highway. It doesn't help us get to Bloomington. And I like coming to IU basketball games and football games, and I've done that through the last decade, so -- but it's not easy. But this is a shot in the arm with what's taken place so far. The first three sections has given us a shot in the arm. And we're just here to share with you that just we don't want to be forgotten about, and that's what's happening to Evansville and that region down there. So this is all southern Indiana. Thank you.

Response:

Comment noted.

PI066 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Ron Brown

PI066-01 **Comment:**

State Road 37 serves as a barrier separating the west side of Bloomington from the rest of the city. It is so difficult to bicycle from one side of State Road 37 to the other that most people do not do it. Those that do usually take a long way around using Vernal Pike on the north side or That Road on the south side. The many people who live in the housing along Vassillate (PHONETIC) [Basswood] Drive have no way of walking across State Road 37. The solution to the problem is a properly placed bicycle bridge between 2nd Street and 3rd Street. Only 10 percent of riders are comfortable with riding in traffic with bike lanes and similar facilities. It should be pointed out that there is no safe design that will get a bicycle past the curved entrance and exit ramps on 3rd Street bridge or 2nd Street bridge. These ramps are nonstopped with no seeing around the corner. A car will turn into a cyclist on an exit ramp. An entrance ramp places a cyclist between lanes of traffic.

The greatest equalization of a bicycle route that crosses State Road 37 would come from people who live in the many homes west of Bloomington. Another large group of users would be people who want to get from central Bloomington to the low traffic areas west of Bloomington.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

I foresee a route from the far west side to downtown using low-volume streets, separated paths, and a bicycle/pedestrian bridge getting heavy use. The City of Bloomington has a goal to become a platinum-level, bicycle-friendly community by 2016. It will deserve that platinum level only if it has this bicycle/pedestrian bridge.

Response:

Please refer to PI046-02 response.

PI067 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Jim Shelton

PI067-01 **Comment:**

Thank you. Good evening. Thank you for this opportunity to come out and learn the details of Section 5 and also to provide input. As someone who supported Crane for over 40 years, I am very encouraged that Section 4 is being built, and I look forward to being able to travel safer and easier road to the Crane Naval Support Activity as well as to the West Gate Certified Technology Park.

But I'm concerned that when that's finished at the end of 2014 that the impact on State Road 37 is going to possibly be negative. We're going to have a lot more traffic, and the road right now is not ready, especially places like Vernal Pike, which can barely deal with congestion now. It's almost unsafe now. So I think we need to identify the safety concerns on 37 and start working on them so that 37 is ready for the increased traffic at the end of 2014 when Section 4 is done.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-23 response.

PI067-02 **Comment:**

And then as to Section 5, I'm encouraged you were able to work out access to the Southern Indiana Medical Center on Tapp Road in spite of its being so close to 2nd Street. And I think that option needs to be maintained as you go through this process to provide access to that medical center.

Response:

Please see PI036-01 response.

PI067-03 **Comment:**

I also encourage you to maximize bike pad [ped] access across I-69 as much as you can. It's very important to this community, as you heard the previous gentleman say, and it's something we really need.



Response:

Please refer to PI046-02 response.

PI067-04 Comment:

And then lastly, I think personally the partial interchange option with Walnut Street is the best option. It serves our local requirements and minimizes the environmental impact on the wetlands in that area.

So thank you very much for the opportunity to provide input.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-46 response.

**PI068 12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)
Elizabeth Venstra**

PI068-01 Comment:

Thank you. I would like to say, first of all, that I do not assume that INDOT will actually complete the I-69 project given the problems with the funding that have been identified, and I don't believe that INDOT should complete the I-69 project. I think Mr. Ruff summed up the matter quite well. Don't build Section 4.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-23 and PO018-16 responses.

PI068-02 Comment:

That said, if Section 5 is built, I believe that the 2nd Street and 3rd Street bridges need significant improvement for bicycle and pedestrian safety. I would urge you to include sidewalks. Whether the 3rd Street bridge is replaced or not, pedestrians need sidewalks to safely cross those. I don't consider a shoulder to be a pedestrian accommodation, and I would also like to support the bicycle bridge that Mr. Brown mentioned.

Now, I believe that all of those things are necessary to cross the barrier that is the highway under whatever number. We need these accommodations for 37, and we need them if it becomes I-69. Really, these are the most important forms of transportation for the future.

Response:

Please refer to PI046-02 response.



PI068-03 **Comment:**

Talking about looking toward the future, I foresee car traffic actually declining relative to other modes of transit. As Bill McKibben says, we need to leave two-thirds to four-fifths of the oil that's been tapped for development in the ground if we're going to avoid going over two degrees Celsius of global warming. Google Bill McKibben and do the math. And if you do the math, I-69 doesn't make sense.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-28 response.

PI069 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Scott Wells

PI069-01 **Comment:**

Thank you very much. My name is Scott Wells. I liked the presentation. Only one glaring fact I didn't see. Where is the money? You had no funding source. And I kept looking for that, and that's the whole problem. Without money -- I used to be on the county council. You got to have money to make things happen. No, I didn't see where a penny of it is coming from. Unless you can guarantee a funding source to complete the project to Indianapolis, why is Governor Mitch Daniels and INDOT wasting more of our precious taxpayers dollars to plan I-69 at this point?

When you look at the history of this thing, this guy started with the NAFTA Treaty in 1992. You got six corridors. One of them goes through Indiana. The problem is they want an interstate. If they knew what we know now that they don't have the money to complete the interstate, and you got, like Ms. Jennings (PHONETIC) says, you got four lanes from 37 from Bloomington to Indianapolis, that qualifies as an interstate, I guarantee if you go back to 1992 and show them, they wouldn't have guaranteed you any money to get this project started because it's supposed to be an interstate, which is fiscally constrained; but you violate that. You have no money to complete the project.

Ms. Jennings put this thing on antibiotic steroids, \$3.8 billion for major move money. It's all gone. Every bit. Right here. Miles to go. Out of cash. How are you going to complete the project?

Response:

Please refer to AF002-23 and PO018-16 responses.

PI069-02 **Comment:**

We've got a major problem here, and this is what I'm worried about is the safety issue. We have four roads that are failing right now in the crossroads, and we've got four stoplights within five miles between Victor Pike and That Road where you're going to tie



in here. And from your own numbers you've got an increase more than doubling the trips of traffic to 25,000 more trips of travel on 37. One-third of that is trucks.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-23 response. Section 3.3.1.2, *Safety*, identifies a reduction in the total number of annual forecasted crashes in 2035 (the design year) when compared to the No Build.

PI069-03

Comment:

And what I'm lastly worried about is are we going to be held hostage here as our body bag count goes up? We've got to get revenue to complete this project. But I think it's terrible to put this community at a safety factor, and you have not showed one penny how you're going to pay for this project. Thank you very much.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-23 responses.

PI070

**12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)
Bruce Storm**

PI070-01

Comment:

Hello. My name is Bruce Storm. I'm a small businessman in Bloomington since 1967. My wife and I have sporn 19 children and grandchildren who have lived and loved this community, and we don't want to do anything to jeopardize it.

But I'm going to tell you that as an active realtor in this county, I have my ear to the ground. And contrary to what public opinion appears to be, my ears to the ground -- and I think I speak for the silent majority of people in this county -- and we applaud INDOT for the tremendous amount of work that they have put forward to bring us a safe and sound highway to this community.

Every country -- every place in this country that is viable economically has an infrastructure system that is good; and southwest Indiana needs this highway, and Bloomington needs it. And thank you from those of us who don't go to every meeting and criticize you for everything that you try to do.

Now, 19 kids and grandchildren have contributed to the traffic congestion in this county, so I think we need to understand. The money will come because this project is too important for it not to come at some point, but we are in a planning session of this highway now. We need to keep that in perspective. Let's plan the highway the way it should be. The money will come eventually.

Response:

Comment noted. Also, please refer to AF002-23 response.



PI070-02 Comment:

My specific point tonight is Vernal Pike. There's an underpass plan for it. I know it's in the middle of two big intersections. They can't have another cloverleaf. But there needs to be -- as you go under the bypass, there needs to be an egress to the south so that you can get to the shopping centers, and an egress to the north so the inner city that comes down Vernal Pike can go north on 37 or 69 and to the shopping center. We must have that inclusion on Vernal Pike.

Response:

An overpass is proposed to connect Vernal Pike on the west to 17th Street on the east of I-69. Please refer to PI099-01 response regarding the connection of Industrial Park Drive and Gates Drive. This project already is included in the Bloomington-Monroe County MPO's Long Range Plan.

PI071 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Melissa Schiff, Melissa A Schiff CPA
Hillview Motel
Hunter Towing
Hunter Storage
Schiff Properties
Serious Sports
Dreams in Motion Dance Academy
Brian's Off-Road

PI071-01 Comment:

Hello. My name is Melissa Schiff. I am opposed to this, but I feel powerless to stop it. So what I'd like to speak about are the concerns to displaced businesses and property owners. I would like to request consideration that allocations of funds be made to advocates so that property owners could have an advocate who is not just a member of the process and could give them an objective opinion and give them help and understanding the process as they lose their properties and their livelihoods.

Response:

Please refer to PI047-01 response.

PI071-02 Comment:

I would request that going forward, meetings be scheduled with displaced business owners prior to acquisition process to add to their expanding understanding of the process before they reach the point of being in the middle of it, which seems to have a 30-to 90-day window, and then you're just no -- (INAUDIBLE). You're ran over. There's only 32 businesses, I believe, in the preferred alternative. I think that's a manageable request.



Response:

Please refer to PI047-01 response.

PI071-03

Comment:

Notification needs to be improved. We found out about being displaced on five of our businesses via the newspaper. I don't think it's outrageous to ask for -- if you can't do a personal phone call, you could have at least sent a letter and said, hey, you might want to read this 1,800-page document. You're losing your property.

Response:

Please refer to PI047-02 response.

PI071-04

Comment:

Acquisitions should also consider minimizing the impact of having to acquire new mortgages. That's a factor that it seems to not have any sympathy for. If you lose your property right now, you may get enough to pay off your mortgage; but you may not be able to get a new mortgage in this economic environment.

Response:

Please refer to PI047-01 and PI047-03 responses.

PI071-05

Comment:

Also, I would ask that businesses receive some assistance with directing traffic and additional allowances for signage to help those clients and customers find you when the access to your business is a lot more challenging to reach.

Response:

Please refer to PI047-04 response.

PI071-06

Comment:

Also would say that if it turns into a toll road, any of our businesses that do survive will probably be destroyed. I represent Melissa Schiff, CPA; Hillgie (PHONETIC) Hotel [Hillgate Motel]; Hunter Tony, Inc. [Hunter Towing, Inc.]; Hunter Storage Ship Preoperty [Hunter Storage; Schiff Properties]; Series Sports [Serious Sports]; Dreams in Motion Dance Academy, and Brian's Off-Road. Thank you.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-23 response.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

PI072 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Jodi Pope

PI072-01 **Comment:**

Thank you. As you said, my name is Jodi Pope. I'm a registered nurse in our community. I care for the pediatric section of our community. I'm happy to have been a Bloomington native. I grew up here myself and very happy to get to take care of all the kids in our community. I have been really excited in recent years to see our community commitment to health and increased awareness of that reach our families and our children. If you look at all of the efforts that have gone into, many of the facilities that our city has, like, the B-Line Trail and the Clear Creek Trail. I want to point out something that Ron Brown was talking about earlier, having a pedestrian and a bicycle road. I think these things -- and a lot of people can say we need these. We need these. People are crossing here. People are crossing there. But I'd like to point out that as you've seen among many cities across the United States, cities that make a commitment to grow this infrastructure, it isn't just for who is crossing now. If you build it, they come. So with these kinds of facilities and infrastructure creating, you are going to allow our community to be far more healthy, and we're going to encourage this behavior.

Right now I'm very proud of Bloomington for growing in things like the B-Line Trail and the Clear Creek Trail. I'd like to see more things like that moving forward. Whether I-69 goes forward or not, which many people here have said, you know, this is a separate part of the discussion. But whatever happens, we need to be aware that just putting, you know, walkways and bike things may not do it. And when we talk about families going from one side of the city to the other, we're going to need something besides that. Thank you.

Response:

Please refer to PI046-02 response.

PI073 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Bruce Bundy

PI073-01 **Comment:**

My name is Bruce Bundy. I've lived in Bloomington, Monroe County for over 50 years. I know the county. I know the terrain. I am a tree hugger. I am an environmentalist, and I believe in global warming. I fought the Marble Hill Nuclear Power Plant, which would have bankrupted the rate payers of the state. I fought the PCB incinerator that Westinghouse proposed to build in Bloomington here.

Guess what? Neither of them were built. I'm batting a thousand. Now I'm fighting I-69. You're wasting money on 19th Century technology. Grow up. Mature. Enter the 21st



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Century. Comprehend? It's not worth any environmental impact because it's not needed, and it's the wrong thing to do.

Interstate highway system was complete in the 19 -- late 1970s. That's what the federal government said. The last section of it was built through Franconia Notch in New Hampshire; and that was a special designation because they didn't want to tear up the canyon there, so they allowed it to be built with two lanes. A little history here. It's the wrong direction.

Response:

Comment noted.

PI073-02

Comment:

Automobile transportation and truck transport have among the highest carbon emissions per passenger mile of any form of transportation. Global warming is a reality. We shouldn't be doing it. We shouldn't do anything to increase and encourage automobile transport and truck transport. We ought to be building trains, high-speed trains. Let's grow up and enter the 21st Century.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-28 response regarding climate change. Non-highway modes are outside the scope of the I-69, Tier 2, Section 5 study.

PI074

12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)

David Stewart

PI074-01

Comment:

Okay. Thank you. My name is Dave Stewart. I live here in Bloomington, and I feel from watching this I-69 travesty for years that we're feeding on ourselves. It's obvious that the vast majority of people who live in Bloomington do not want I-69. Every single poll has shown that. But it's been rammed through because some people are collaborating with the effort, and some people are gaining money from it. The people who live in Bloomington would like to keep it in a place where you have clean air to breathe and where it's nice to be around. We're not interested in GDP growth as it's measured. The area down in southwest Indiana is beautiful as it is and doesn't need to grow up and become some sort of Eastern seaboard.

It's just indicative of our times that we see both the Democrats and the Republicans facilitating this effort, which is against our best interest. And we look at people across the world like in Afghanistan and Iraq, Libya, places that are bombed because they have no voice; and we look at ourselves, and we see that we do not have any voice either. It's a sad indictment on our society that I-69 is being pushed. It's a sad indictment on all those who are trying to make the best of it. It should be stopped. It should have been stopped years ago, and it should be stopped right now.



Response:

Comment noted.

PI0075 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Nan Brewer

PI0075-01 **Comment:**

I question the logic of putting an interchange at Fullerton Pike, the first one into Bloomington. This is not an existing commercial thoroughfare. It would simply be taking large numbers of cars and trucks and dumping them onto established residential streets. If you look at the traffic counts for Fullerton Pike east of State Road 37, it was 516 in 2002, 782 in 2006, the last time it was taken. This is by far the lowest traffic count of any roadway taken by the Monroe County Highway Department for that part of the county. This is not an industrial hub, nor with its cracky terrain likely to become one.

If Fullerton Pike is connected to Gordon Pike, it would increase the number of cars and trucks through numerous neighborhoods, past two middle schools and over two rails to trails by 40 percent. When I mentioned this to an INDOT representative -- that I mentioned that this would be unsafe and cause major, not low residential impact as is stated as a criteria for choosing a preferred alternative, she said that this road was the county's decision, so basically not theirs.

I just heard tonight that if this corridor isn't built, this interchange could be changed. This -- the county telling that the roadway is needed because of the interchange.

This is a situation of the chicken and the egg with each side blaming the other, and the only potential losers are the residents of our neighborhoods. I ask that our -- the interchanges reflect current business zoning and established traffic patterns and not make our residential roads into urban arteries. Thank you.

Response:

Please refer to PI046-03 response.

PI076 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Jen Miers

PI076-01 **Comment:**

Thank you. I also want to second the opposition to the Fullerton Pike interchange. I'm a resident in that area of the county, and the effects on that neighborhood and the Clear Creek Trail would be devastating. So I hope you will consider another alternative for the first intersection from I-69 to Bloomington.



Response:

Please refer to PI046-03 response.

PI076-02

Comment:

I also want to second or fifth the comments that have been made tonight about the need for a dedicated bike/pedestrian bridge crossing 37/69. I know you mentioned that improvements would be made to existing overpasses, like, 2nd and 3rd. I don't think any improvements can be made to those and make them safe for people walking or riding a bike. I know that this request in some quarters seems frivolous; however, there are many people who have no choice but to use a bike or walk between those businesses and residences and need to have access.

And if many of you drove here tonight, people a lot of times don't have a choice when they go to the store or pick up a prescription or go to work. They would be on those roads at night. And I just really feel without a dedicated bridge, pedestrians and cyclists would not be safe crossing the 37/69 barrier. Thank you.

Response:

Please refer to PI046-02 for response.

PI077

**12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)
Jennifer Mickel**

PI077-01

Comment:

My name is Jennifer Mickel, and all that from the man who has taken our property rights by signing Monroe County Comprehensive Plan.

Thank you for arranging this forum, and thank you for your good points, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Griffith, Mr. Brown, and Nan Brewer and others.

Regarding the completion worries, surely everybody here who has ever gone to Indianapolis recently will say in the last 30 years has noticed all of that very inconvenient construction where they widen the road, and so I don't think we really need to worry about the safety issue because we'll have nice, clear traffic with less access from Evansville up to here. And then as we get out of here, at least for a while, it will just get slower and slower until we get to Indy. So I don't really think that that's -- I think it's like people have their panties in a twist, so. . .

Okay. Surely, ineligible voters are aware that Indiana is one of the only solvent states in the United States. We have had a surplus. And in our state if we manage to keep conservative government, we will not have to worry about funds in the future.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Response:

Comment noted. A maintenance of traffic plan will be incorporated into the final design activities. Please refer to AF002-23 and PO018-16 response for discussion of funding.

PI077-02

Comment:

Climate change is happening because of the cycles in the universe. This still requires godly stewardship of mother earth, though. And if you wanted to add the train, why did you turn out insisting on making those throughways bypass? And I am all for bypass, but now we don't have a train path, you know.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-28 response.

PI077-03

Comment:

Let's stop being selfish to the folks south of us since we have easy access to -- and we do have easy access to Indy. Let us participate and make this done deal be done well. Thank you.

Response:

Comment noted.

PI078

**12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)
Fred Walsh**

PI078-01

Comment:

Thank you. Mary Jo Hamman mentioned that INDOT constructs using requirements presented in a contract titled, "The Memorandum of Understanding." This is a lie. "The Memorandum of Understanding" is a contract that INDOT was ordered to sign because they were caught using caves and sinkholes to their advantage by plumbing all the toxic drainage directly into them to get rid of the waste. This contract came from a court case in 1993 when INDOT was building Highway 37 between Bedford and Mitchell. These inconsiderate construction practices are still occurring. "The Memorandum of Understanding" is a commitment from INDOT to offset unavoidable impacts to caves by assigning certain responsibilities to construction activity. This contract is to ensure that the transportation needs of Indiana are met in an environmentally sensitive manner that protects the habitat of all species and that design and construction practices must protect groundwater quality, public health, safety, and the environment. This contract specifies the need for hazardous material traps, PETE [peat] filters, wide grassy areas to protect creek groundwater and specifies the need for continual inspections and testing.

You must be aware of the environmental impacts that will occur if construction activities are conducted in the usual manner. It will have lethal effects on wildlife contamination of groundwater and air pollution. Indiana is one of the most polluted states in the

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

country. Completing I-69 might bring Indiana to the top of the list. INDOT should stop construction immediately for the sake of this town and for the world as a whole. The least that INDOT should do is follow through with their commitment and abide by the law-abiding contract.

My home is 300 feet from where I-69 plans to be built in Section 4. There's a cave nearby that is 400 feet from where I-69 plans to be built. Three drain pipes are planned to direct toxic runoff into the creek that leads to this precious cave. INDOT only plans a single -- protection basin for each runoff route. There are nearly a dozen items specified -- in "The Memorandum of Understanding" that INDOT has not shown proof of the -- When I request a response from INDOT, it must -- recently took one and a half months for -- and that requires that filtration is up to interpretation. The only filtration that INDOT plans -- is less than 400 feet -- from the cave is a ditch with rocks in it. A ditch with rocks in it is not enough filtration for caves.

Response:

The Karst MOU has governed INDOT construction in karst areas since it was adopted in 1993. For further information, please see AS006-06 response.

PI079 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Roger Heimer

PI079-01 **Comment:**

Thank you. This is a very difficult thing to talk about for me in this community knowing how many of my friends, family, and others disagree with me, but I would be a coward if I did not speak out about what I think is right. We've lived here for 12 years, lived in Evansville one year. I lived in Indianapolis about 16 years. I don't know whether I've been to Evansville in the last 12 years. I've probably been to Indianapolis hundreds of times, and based on that experience I say that it would be a great mistake to follow the lead of people in Indianapolis ending up in the Star and say that we don't really need to finish the job because most of the travel -- really, the traffic is to Indianapolis and not to Evansville.

I did present written comments last year, and I thought, well, maybe that was a little cowardly not to stand here before the people in the community and say what I believe.

Why do I say this? I really wondered what was right for a long time. And then one day coming back from Indianapolis I drove by the scene of a fatal accident, and then farther down the road at yet another intersection I saw a vehicle overturned on its side. And I wondered, is this a safe road? And I called INDOT, and they said there are no statistics on this.

Then I saw in the Mooresville paper that, my goodness, there was a grant to the State Police for extra paroles [patrols] because it's such an unsafe road. There are so many serious and fatal accidents. So I took my stand in favor of this.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Now, what went wrong with the road between here and Indianapolis? It's unfettered development. That's what it is. I need to say that; that I'm not standing here with the Chamber of Commerce. I'm standing here because Chambers of Commerce have had businesses opening up new traffic 78 places where you could get onto that road. We need a safe road. A safe road by definition would be an interstate.

Now, I'm an environmentalist, too. I'm a Democrat, too. You Democrats need to know that. And environmentalists would say I get good mileage on my General Motors car when I get on the interstate, but I get very poor mileage from here to Indianapolis. Environmentally or safety, save lives. We need that last stretch.

Response:

Comment noted. Crash reductions are one of the goals of the Section 5 project. See FEIS Table 3-9 for crash reductions attributable to this project.

PI080

12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)

Donna Lentz

PI080-01

Comment:

First of all, we're all community. We learn -- we're all community, and we need to work together. We're not going to all get what we want, but we need to understand the other person's point of view. So while most of us are busy trying to play -- trying to win at the game of life, there's been a circle of people who have been playing monopoly with our land. While an interstate may benefit southwest Indiana, Evansville to Crane, the purpose of an interstate is to move vehicles and cargo quickly as possible from point A to B. So I'm wondering how carbon can move terrain with the curves and hills from Crane to 37 will help Evansville to Indy traffic move faster?

It would work better to have chosen the route that would have taken I-69 north to Indy from Crane and upgrade 45 to Crane. If economic development depends on Bloomington having an interstate through its commerce area, then it would have been better to have used existing roadways rather than to use all the new terrain.

And I live out there. New terrain is going through. And I've watched a lot of my neighbors lose their homes and their property and then have this big sign slapped on their house on every single window. And when you live next door to somebody with this on their window, it makes you sick every day.

Response:

Please refer to PI044-01 response.



PI080-02 Comment:

If Bloomington thinks it has a deer problem now, just wait because all of these country roads have tons of deer at night and stand around, and they're going to head on into town, and so will the coyotes.

Response:

Comment noted.

PI080-03 Comment:

And I want to know about air quality.

Response:

No specific comment about air quality is identified. Air quality is discussed in the FEIS in Section 4.6, *Air Quality*, and Section 5.9, *Air Quality*.

PI080-04 Comment:

And to the future governor I ask for him to, please, relook at all of this and reevaluate. I know he wants to follow Mitch Daniels, but I would like for him to have a voice of his own and look and be reasonable about the future of everyone, and it's not all about economic development.

Response:

Comment Noted.

**PI081 12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)
Sarah Rogers**

PI081-01 Comment:

Okay. Thank you, and thank you for letting us share our comments tonight. There are certainly many benefits for 69, but I'd like to make my comments specific to Section 5.

I-69 has become a reality with Sections 1 through 3 opening last month. With Section 4 scheduled to open in 2014, we need to prepare for the increase in traffic that the highway will bring to our area. The best way to do that is to identify areas of importance to our community, particularly in the design phase. By building the highway, we reduce congestion and lower accident rates.

In looking at the build versus the no-build models, it is clear that the overall negative-traffic impacts will be much higher with the no-build scenario. We need to identify areas of potential safety concern and address those areas first so that the existing State Road 37 is able to handle traffic safety when Section 4 is complete. For example, as has been mentioned tonight, Vernal Pike has issues with safety and congestion.



Response:

Please refer to AF002-23 response.

PI081-02

Comment:

Maintaining a partial interchange at North Walnut Street is important for our community and will limit the environmental and cost impacts of a full interchange. We encourage INDOT and Monroe County officials to continue working together about specific options on the North Walnut interchange.

Response:

Plases refer to AF002-46 response.

PI081-03

Comment:

And finally, we support the idea of reusing existing infrastructure to save costs when possible, but also encourage the inclusion of bike/ped access for new build or improved overpasses. Thank you.

Response:

Please refer to PI046-02 for response.

PI082 12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)

Tom Elliott

PI082-01

Comment:

Thank you. I -- my intentions weren't to get up and speak this evening; but I did want to hear people talk, and I want to take a more formal approach to this concern in the future. However, I felt compelled to say a few words regarding the interstate that's been built up to this point. I know -- my feeling is the road is going to be completed to Bloomington, and because of that I certainly hope it's completed to Indianapolis.

There approximately were 168 bridges in this construction from what I read in the paper, and around three of them were constructed out of steel. The rest were all concrete and other products used. Steel is a 100 percent recyclable material. It's made out of 100 percent recyclable material. If when some day these bridges have to be replaced -- and they will -- they can be all recycled. I don't know about the alternative product.

There are competitive products right now. The mills are probably at some of their lowest prices they've had. Bridge fabricators are hungry. There's four bridge fabricators in the State of Indiana to do steel bridges besides the steel mills in the State of Indiana that manufacture the steel for the fabricators to buy to make steel bridges.

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

From what I know, most of the concrete bridges were supplied by out-of-state companies, and if not all of them were. Also, that provides jobs in this state. As a taxpayer, I'm concerned that the money wasn't put back into the State, and the steel didn't get a fair shot. I feel that there's reasons they look at cost and so forth. Steel is very competitive right now. Getting steel is very easy right now. The mills are running probably 60 percent capacity. Fabricators are hungry. I'm hoping in consideration of the rest of this road that steel will be -- there will be an opportunity for steel to have a chance.

I know some politicians like to talk about jobs in Indiana. I think one even mentioned that he'd like to see Indiana companies get first dibs on the state contracts. This would have been a great opportunity, and I hope it's considered in the future. Thank you.

Response:

The material type for bridge structures is determined in final design on a case by case basis. This determination is based upon initial construction cost and life-cycle maintenance costs.

PI083 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Steve Brewer

PI083-01 **Comment:**

I'm against -- well, the Fullerton Pike decision has galvanized many of us to oppose this project. It was initially planned 50 years ago, I believe, before 37 itself had even been connected. Nevertheless, because somebody drew a line a half a century ago, the highway is now going to become a four-lane artery into completely inappropriate terrain for the kind of development they're hoping for. And now in the ensuing 50 years housing additions have built up all along there, so now we're going to have one of the major arteries into this city through a developed neighborhood area. So I guess the social realities on Gordon Pike no longer fit the plan, and so I'm opposed to the Fullerton Pike exchange.

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to PI046-03 response.

PI084 **11/28/2012 Letter (INDOT)**
Deborah Hedrick Reed

PI084-01 **Comment:**

I am writing to you about a historic property that was not included in your October, 2012 letter (DVD) concerning:

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Tier 2) for the I-69, Evansville to Indianapolis project for Section 5 between Bloomington and Martinsville, Indiana.



[FHWA-IN-EIS-12-01-D]

Located at 3275 N. Prow Road, Bloomington, Indiana, is the very old and historic Parks-Patton-Hedrick House and farm. It is not a grand mansion but it is quite historic. Our nation's 16th President, A. Lincoln, lived in modest log homes in Kentucky and southern Indiana. Likewise the Parks-Patton-Hedrick House has stone and huge hand hewn beams in the earliest part of the structure. Tax documents have people living in the house in 1874. Monroe County Tax Duplicates known to exist did not begin until 1842. The family cemetery which was once part of the original farm, but now part of the National Registry's Maple Grove Road Historic District, have people buried in the 1830s and 1840s. Those people lived and owned the present day Hedrick farm and home as documented on the abstract. There are many more grave stones which are not legible. In 1998 the Maple Grove area was given National Designation and it has local and state designation. The Parks-Patton-Hedrick House was lived in before many of the Maple Grove district structures were built! Many of the beautiful, historically protected places throughout Bloomington, Indiana University campus and Monroe County, were built after the Parks-Patton-Hedrick House. Due to an oversight, The Parks-Patton-Hedrick House was not included in the Maple Grove Historic District but should have due to adjacent location, history, home, farm, original cemetery existing before most included in the Maple Grove district. It is the 14th oldest surviving structure in Monroe County! (See enclosure: A)

The Parks-Patton-Hedrick House was given local historic designation after application; a thorough review and grueling four step process:

Monroe County Historic Preservation Board
Monroe County Plan Review Committee
Monroe County Plan Commission
Monroe County Commissioners

The many people on the above commissions and boards are very intelligent, thorough, demanding and possess a high degree of common sense. They knew their reputations were on the line concerning the Parks-Patton-Hedrick House. The County officials enthusiastically bestowed historic designation on the farm and house based on:

- “1) an association with events that have made significant contributions to the broad patterns of county history;
- 2) an association with the lives of persons significant in the county's past;
- 3) the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of contribution.”

The local officials were keenly interested and hoping I would further research: "the capability of yielding information in prehistory or history" as the house's yards, farm, house and people have deep connections to the limestone industry and prehistoric settlements. Local quarries, close to the house and farm, opened up in the late 1860s. 3275 N. Prow Road was originally part of the Hunter Valley Historic Quarry District. We have proof of prehistoric history which was formed 330 million years ago...the stone and shark's teeth. The home's basement/the first house, has a solid stone ledge basement floor, limestone foundation walls, stone steps and stone walls leading to ground level which is another solid stone ledge of Salem-Oolitic limestone. Early settlers

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

had to know the nature of these limestone deposits. The basement and ground level room floor remain exactly the same...solid Salem-Oolitic limestone. In addition, prehistoric people lived in the area. Artifacts found around the house and farm have been dated (8000-200 BC), photographed and are still in our possession. (See: enclosures: B & C)

Earlier findings by the FHWA and INDOT reported many changes to the Parks-Patton-Hedrick House. This is not the case. Only one (1) window is not original. Every other window, top to bottom, is original. The siding put on can come off. Mr. Phillip Hedrick, my dad, thinking he was doing a good thing, put on aluminum siding to preserve the historic house. All the original wood is still in tact and in great shape due to Dad's efforts. Please see Enclosure D, prepared by my 89 year old mother, and you can read everything still existing, original to the house. Frankly, the reason the house (187 4-to last renovation in 1912) is "intact" is due to no money for changes. (See enclosure: D)

We have applied for State designation. Telling you every bit of truth, our first application was denied. The submitted application was a first ever attempt of its kind by a talented, wonderful lady. The State has graciously agreed to accept additional data, photographs and documents for re-submission and review. We believe the house and farm worthy.

In conclusion, in the book: "Counties of Morgan, Monroe and Brown, Indiana" by Charles Blanchard, 1884, the very first people who bought land, September 1816, in Bloomington-Monroe County were: George Hedrick, Joseph Taylor, Henry Wampler and James Parks. All four of these men, bravely opening and settling Bloomington/Monroe County, are tied to the Parks-Patton-Hedrick House, farm and cemetery. (enclosure: E)

With great respect, please, please re-consider your position concerning this 14th oldest, surviving historic home and farm. My family keenly understands the value of this place for Monroe County and Indiana. We so desperately want to save the house and land for further generations to see the past...330 millions years ago; 8000-200 BC; the 1816s; 1874s to present day all in one place! Thank you.

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for enclosures. Note, enclosures also included letter from INDOT submitting the DEIS.]

Response:

Responses to comments related to cultural resources (above-ground and below-ground) are provided as an appendix to the 800.11(e) Documentation. Please reference Appendix I. *CORRESPONDENCE/COMMENTS RECEIVED/TRANSMITTED FOLLOWING SECTION 106 REVIEW PERIOD (OCTOBER 2012 TO JANUARY 2013)* of the 800.11.(e) Documentation, located in **Appendix N, Section 106 Documentation**, of the FEIS. The reference cited provides a detailed rationale regarding why the referenced property was determined not to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. No land acquisition is planned at this property under the Refined Preferred Alternative.



PI085 **1/2/2013 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Robert L. Cooksey

PI085-01 **Comment:**

Alternative 8 proposes to displace all residents of this area. There are about 60 acres in Morgan County with 5 residences; 4 homes, 1 trailer and 3 barns on Cooksey Lane. In Monroe County 1 trailer and approximately 65 acres; most of the acreage is farm land. This proposal will cause this land to not have an exit or entrance.

We believe that a road that would run parallel to SR 37 from Cooksey Lane to Pine Boulevard would be less expensive than buying all the land, property and timber.

Response:

An analysis has been completed to review the benefits of providing access to the Cooksey Lane/Petro Road properties and effects on the various environmental resources and construction costs to do so. The FEIS continues to identify these properties as potential displacements. Please note that the final determinations about access, including which properties are acquired, will take place as part of the final design process.

PI086 **12/20/2012 Letter (Project Office)**
Robert C. Sturgis, Owner, Sturgis Garage

PI086-01 **Comment:**

This letter is in regards to the most recent proposal that I have discussed with INDOT personnel related to the auxiliary road near my place of business. My business is Sturgis Garage and is located on Hensonburg Road near Vernal Pike and Hwy 37 interchange. The proposed location of this access road has changed several times since I was informed about it. Like many that are affected by the changes related to the I-69 project, I have several concerns related to my business. I am told that the access road will be located to the east of my business and Hensonburg Road will become a dead-end road. I am troubled about not having a thoroughfare past my business. This could impact my customer's ability to locate and utilize our services. This decreased visibility for customers and potentially increased safety or crime issues as result of the dead-end road make this proposal lead me to believe that my business could be adversely impacted. Please keep me informed of any additional changes or updates. My family has done business at this location since 1975. I do not want to be negatively impacted by this auxiliary road.

Response:

Please see PI005-01 response. An early kitchen table meeting with this property owner was held May 1, 2013. Final determinations about access, including which properties are acquired, will take place as part of the final design process.



PI087 **12/20/2012 E-mail**
Joan Middendorf

PI087-01 **Comment:**

All comments from the Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce should be ruled out. The Immediate Past Chair of their Board of Directors is Lee Carmichael of Weddle Bros. Construction, builders of the highway. Of course they favor the construction! The President of James Madison University in Virginia, a graduate of IU Bloomington, told me recently that his city has a major highway and that the 10,000 trucks per day that traverse that highway produce noise and exhaust particles that lower the quality of life in Harrisonburg.

Bloomington's quality of life is the "product" that we have to offer. Building major highways at this point in the global climate debacle is like investing in a canal in the 1820s.

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to AF002-28 regarding climate change.

PI088 **12/20/2012 E-mail**
Jason Green

PI088-01 **Comment:**

I am not in favor of Section 5 alternative 8. I would rather I-69 be routed far East of town, and more preferably not at all near town, for the following reasons.

1. Weather and wind flows west to east -- this would preserve air quality.
2. There is no good way to traverse town west to east (or vice versa) without encountering residential and/or traffic. The current plan would increase that problem significantly for tourists and locals alike.
3. The plan, as it exists now, would have to construct over 2 prime limestone quarry areas where sinkholes could occur even after construction. These are the quarries by Tapp Road and at the 46 interchange.
4. The primary purpose of this interstate is international transport of hydrocarbons such as natural gas and refined oil. Thus, the likelihood of a catastrophic spill occurring in our area that affects our wildlife, homes, and businesses is enormous -- in fact, I would say it is just a matter of time before a spill occurs.
5. Increased traffic by Crane results in increased people realizing it has poor perimeter security and/or wondering what its purpose is.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

6. To increase local business opportunities, a diversity of products needs to be offered. Interstates tend to unify products (i.e. chain restaurants that lead to obesity), whereas state and local roads tend to diversify them.

7. The federal government is planning to increase its presence on all interstate roads with activities similar to the TSA at airports. Do we really want to be dependent on federal funding and oversight just to endure nuisances, intrusions, and global influences?

8. Why does the speed at which you convey yourself matter more to society than the quality? The average age of a Bloomington resident is 21. They typically spend 4 years here to study, and then they leave. Building a highway increases the odds of brain drain -- I gaurentee you that.

9. The less we as a society rely on energy to create economy, the more sustainable! and less reliant on government we become. Are not both goals the dignified path?

10. Bloomington just spent a fortune renovating Tapp road... and now you guys want to rip it up again.

Response:

This comment overall suggests a new routing far outside the corridor approved in the Tier 1 ROD. As such, it addresses a Tier 1 issue which is beyond the scope of this Tier 2 study. Please refer to P0006-01 response. In regards to I-69 Section 5 impacts, please refer to Section 5.9, *Air Quality*; Section 5.6, *Traffic Impacts*; Section 5.19, *Water Resources*; Section 5.21 *Karst Impacts*; and Section 5.25, *Energy*. Section 7.3, *Section 5 Mitigation Measures and Commitments*, identifies measures to control and/or mitigate impacts. Coordination with the City of Bloomington has occurred throughout the development of the project.

PI089 **1/2/2013 Comment Form (Project Office)**
John C. Cooksey

PI089-01 **Comment:**

Alternative 8 proposes to displace all residents of this area. There are about 60 acres in Morgan County with 5 residences; 4 homes, 1 trailer and 3 barns on Cooksey Lane. In Monroe County 1 trailer and approximately 65 acres; most of the acreage is farm land. This proposal will cause this land to not have an exit or entrance.

We believe that a road that would run parallel to SR 37 from Cooksey Lane to Pine Boulevard would be less expensive than buying all the land, property and timber.

Response:

Please refer to PI085-01 response.



PI090 **12/26/2012 Email (Baker) /Letter**
Matt Mabrey, Facilities Construction Project Manager,
Management Services Division, Hoosier Energy REC, Inc.

PI090-01 **Comment:**

[12/28/2012 Email submittal (Kardynalski)]

Sent on behalf of Matt Mabrey.

[No date email (Mabrey)]

Please accept our comments concerning I-69 section 5 alternative 8. The paper copy was sent via FedEx, tracking number 794389243405. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

[12/26/2012 letter (Mabrey)]

Please accept our comments regarding the proposed I-69 Alternative 8, section 5. As we understand, an option A and option B exists for the North Walnut St. interchange, more specifically shown on "Section 5: Plan and Profile INDOT Preferred Alternative Sheet 6A of 28 and 6b of 28".

Preface

Hoosier Energy needs to maintain the same level and quality of access we currently have to both our headquarters facility and to the Bloomington substation near Norm Anderson Road. Both locations have unique ingress and egress requirements including long and heavy loads that are necessary for Hoosier Energy to conduct business functions. Our ability to maintain the highest level of service to member systems and the 300,000 homes, fanns and businesses they serve cannot be compromised.

The proposed layout of alternative 8 presents serious concerns for us at four locations along the proposed corridor:

I Headquarters Location

As shown in Alternative 8, The north-south "Hoosier Energy bypass" around the east side of our property was eliminated presumably in lieu of a two lane, bidirectional access road located immediately east and parallel to I-69, and directly in front our Headquarters facility. This configuration as shown will not allow suitable access for high, wide and heavy loads, and long vehicles like mobile substations that require a wide turning radius and sufficient length to exit our facility onto an access road. Specifically, our mobile equipment fleet consists of units that weigh up to 125,000 lbs.; are up to 140' in length, 15' high and turning radius of 130'. It is difficult to envision how a vehicle with the described specification can egress onto a two lane, bi-directional access road built with standard width and shoulder dimensions. In addition, it appears regular access in and out of our Headquarters facility will also be greatly compromised by the current plan to the point we will be unable to continue to operate some business



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

functions from our current location. For example, the proposed right of way appears to encroach upon our safety and training facility as well as parking.

Response:

See response AF002-02. With the refinement included as part of this east side access road in Refined Preferred Alternative 8, the roadway ends in a cul-de-sac at Connaught Road which serves as the current access point to the Hoosier Energy headquarters facility and one private residence. As drivers approach the cul-de-sac, travel speeds will be reduced, as will the possibility of opposing traffic, affording more opportunities for the large loads cited in the comment to traverse the intersection into the headquarters facility. As part of the final design, additional review of these traffic patterns, including turning radii, will be conducted. Intersections will be designed to incorporate appropriate wheel paths associated with turning movements. The standard truck size for this facility is designated by the Indiana Design Manual as WB-65.

PI090-02

Comment:

II North Walnut St.

In regards to accessing I-69 from the proposed access road, the proposed alternative is problematic in both options A and B (concerning North Walnut St. interchange). Option A, which consists of a full interchange at North Walnut St. would require our fleet vehicles to traverse south from our current location via access road a distance of 1 mile and then negotiate a 90 degree turn onto the interchange and then, if proceeding south, negotiate another 90 degree turn onto an access ramp. Both left hand turns, and the approach curve off of the south bound access road and, I-69 southbound access curve appear such that semi-trailer loads with maximum turning radius of 130 ft. could not be accommodated, or even possible. Further, we are concerned that the proposed configuration would be problematic for other traffic while our high and wide loads attempt to access the interchange and interstate.

Option B is even more restrictive as it appears there is only north bound I-69 access from the North Walnut St. interchange, and therefore if the load destination was south from our facility, the vehicle would need to travel 1.5 miles north to Sample Road interchange and then backtrack. Also, the same concern about short radius, 90 degree turns to accommodate high, wide and long loads exist at the Walnut St. interchange only in this option, it is the right hand turn.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-46 and PI090-01 responses.

PI090-03

Comment:

III Sample Road

If the North Walnut St. Option B interchange option was selected, south bound loads would have to first travel north to the Sample Road interchange to access I-69. Under this scenario, we are concerned this configuration at Sample Rd. can accommodate our



high, wide and long loads. More specifically, we are concerned about the first 90 degree left hand turn off of the access road, and then another 90 degree right hand turn onto the access ramp; and finally a hairpin curve to access I-69. Long sweeping radius curves are necessary to accommodate our loads.

Response:

As part of the final design, intersections will be designed to incorporate appropriate wheel paths associated with turning movements. The standard truck size for this facility is designated by the Indiana Design Manual as WB-65.

PI090-04

Comment:

IV Norm Anderson Rd.

The Bloomington substation is located near Norm Anderson Rd. Specific access is needed at the Bloomington substation to meet routine and emergency service requirements:

- a. Access must facilitate INDOT permitted oversize loads with up to 140 ft. overall length and gross vehicle weight of 125,000 lbs. (comments b. through e. refer to 140' ft. overall length with gross vehicle weight of 125,000 lbs.) .
- b. Access from interstate to service road and service road to interstate for oversize loads and non-permitted vehicles.
- c. Substation must be accessible from any proposed service road. The service road must have a west bound turnoff to access the substation that is capable of accommodating oversize loads.
- d. Approach grade to substation must be suitable to facilitate oversize loads for resting at grade and turning radius. Proper deceleration lane to be provided from service road to access road.
- e. Any barriers provided between the substation and the service road must be movable to allow emergency ingress and egress to the substation. Our access to the Bloomington substation cannot be delayed due to installation of the movable barriers.

Additionally, we have occasional needs to replace large transformers in the Bloomington substation and sufficient access must be provided. This transformer is transported via truck and it weighs 583,000 lbs., is 193' long, 18'4" high and maintains a turning radius of 190'. Driveable access for these loads from the nearest rail yard siding is needed (typically up near Indianapolis or Franklin). With some of the proposed overpasses, we may not have any way off the highway if our loads are too tall to go under the overpasses. The Chamber's Pike proposed overpass is an example; where would we get off the Interstate to get around this overpass?

Relocation of this substation is not an option due to the enormous cost as well as disruption to over 100,000 customers. In addition, this substation is shared by another utility which makes it even more impractical to consider relocation due to potential coordination issues.



Response:

See PI090-01 and PI090-03. The Indiana Design Manual (Chapters 402¹ and 53²) provides design standards for interstate highway overpasses. A minimum vertical clearance of 16'-6" is required for new construction, which includes a six inch allowance for future resurfacing. The Refined Preferred Alternative utilizes newly constructed overpasses with vertical clearances that meet these design standards. Coordination with Hoosier Energy will continue through final design. Travel by vehicles with loads and lengths such as those described in this comment require special permitting procedures.

Access to the Bloomington substation would occur from the Sample Road interchange (south of the substation) to Sample Road northward to Lee Paul Road northward to an I-69 Section 5 local access road that would travel alongside I-69 and beyond the substation property. Alternatively, the east side access road can be utilized between Sample Road and Chambers Pike, west across the Chambers Pike bridge, and then south to the substation. The Bloomington Substation is not being considered as a potential relocation.

PI090-05

Comment:

In summary, INDOT's plans, as they affect both our headquarters facility and our Bloomington sub-station, significantly reduce the value of those properties, possibly to the point where they have little or no use or value.

Please contact me at 812-876-0215 or mmabrey@hepn.com if there are questions about our preferences or if additional information is required.

Enclosures:

Section 5: plan and profile INDOT preferred alternative w comments Sheet 6A of 28

Section 5: plan and profile INDOT preferred alternative w comments Sheet 6B of 28

Section 5: plan and profile INDOT preferred alternative w comments Sheet 7 of 28

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for enclosures.]

Response:

Identified design related issues will be included in the final engineer's report and there will be continued coordination with Hoosier Energy during final design to address specific concerns of this utility.

PI091

1/2/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)

¹ IDM Chapter 402-6.02(02), Figure 402-6J, Vertical Clearance

² IDM Chapter 53, Figure 53-1, Geometric Design Criteria For Freeway



Charles Wm. Cooksey

PI091-01 Comment:

Alternative 8 proposes to displace all residents of this area. There are about 60 acres in Morgan County with 5 residences; 4 homes, 1 trailer and 3 barns on Cooksey Lane. In Monroe County 1 trailer and approximately 65 acres; most of the acreage is farm land. This proposal will cause this land to not have an exit or entrance.

We believe that a road that would run parallel to SR 37 from Cooksey Lane to Pine Boulevard would be less expensive than buying all the land, property and timber.

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for copy of map with proposed local service road.]

Response:

Please refer to PI085-01 response.

**PI092 1/2/2013 Comment Form (Project Office)
Peirie Braganza**

PI092-01 Comment:

Subject: Cooksey Lane

Alternative 8 proposes displacement of all residents of this area. We, the property owners, wish to propose our idea, as shown on the attached sketch.

Proposal:

Build a service road to run parallel to 37/69 from Cooksey Lane to Pine Boulevard, approx. one mile. This would eliminate the displacement of 11 families and minimize travel time to Godsey Road Exchange.

[Referenced sketch is included with Charles Wm. Cooksey Comment PI091 (see FEIS Volume III Part B) as he is the one who provided it.]

Response:

Please refer to PI085-01 response.

**PI093 12/12/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)
Barbara Leininger**

PI093-01 Comment:

It has come to my attention that my home will be greatly affected by Section 5 of I-69. From the map that I saw at the project office, it appears that several houses and



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

businesses will be “relocated” due to the construction, leaving my house at the end of the line with the rest of the houses left standing. This will also place me the closest to the exit ramp, the closest to the noise, the closest to the exhaust fumes, etc. Basically it looks like I-69 will be my backyard.

Since I have lived in my home, approximately 12 years, I have had a vacant lot next door affording me a nice wooded area next to my backyard as well as a “buffer area” between me and 37. Even with that, I do get some noise from 37. I can’t imagine what it will be like if the current plan comes to fruition. From what I can tell most of I-69 has not come this close to existing homes. If there are no other options, I would rather have the government purchase my house. The thought of having to live right next to an Interstate and exit ramp is so upsetting.

The health issues, noise, exhaust fumes, loss of enjoyment of backyard are so upsetting. Please let me know what my options are. I would rather move than face the alternative.

Of course, I haven’t mentioned the obvious that my house has probably lost value and may be impossible to sell.

Response:

The FEIS identifies a partial acquisition of this property. Any partial acquisition of land from this property would occur in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-646). Displacements and right-of-way purchases will be finalized in design. Additionally, the Judd Avenue/Fullerton Pike intersection is proposed to be closed. Fullerton Pike will be accessed through other local roads within the Garden Acres neighborhood.

PI094 **1/1/2013 E-mail (I-69)**
Kyle & Pamela Chapman

PI094-01 **Comment:**

While we applaud the choice of the path for the new I69 highway that will go past the Windsor Private homes, between Sample Road and Chambers Pike, the noise level experienced in our residential subdivision remains an ongoing concern. And with the construction of I-69, the noise level will likely increase in volume even more. Higher noise levels will have a negative impact on this peaceful neighborhood. Please consider noise abatement in this area to help improve the quality life and preserve our property values. And at a minimum, please do a noise study during times of high travel on Hwy 37.

Response:

Please refer to PI049-01 response.



PI095 **12/20/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Rich Grimes

PI095-01 **Comment:**

Please consider the Industrial Drive extension to a service road coming off of the ramp that goes south bound from the S.R. 46 interchange- (See drawing attached)

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for copy of attached drawing.]

Response:

Such a road is not included as part of this project. Access continues to be provided from Industrial Drive to SR 46 via other roads connecting to Vernal Pike.

PI096 **12/20/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Rich Grimes

PI096-01 **Comment:**

The new I-69 interstate highway that is going to be next to the Bike Park (Wapehani) would be better for the savings to take 50' of the bike park to east than remove several homes to the west and spend considerably more money.

Response:

Please refer to PI011-01 response.

PI097 **12/17/2012 Letter (Project Office)**
William J. Cuttill

PI097-01 **Comment:**

I am William J. Cuttill, owner of the property located at 2812 S. Yonkers St., Bloomington, IN 47403. I spend winters (Nov.-March) in Florida. My Florida address is

William J. Cuttill
1452 Whisper Circle
Sebring, FL 33870
(863) 385-0722

Please contact me at the above address or phone during the November 1 through March 31 period with future updates.

I was unable to attend your presentation on Thursday, December 6, 2012, but my daughter, Michelle Webster, attended to represent my interests and concerns.

I need to clarify that I am not a lawyer nor have I spoken to an attorney about my concerns and issues. It is my hope that I can work directly with your office to resolve



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

these concerns or if they cannot be resolved, arrangements can be made for the equitable purchase of the property.

I have found interest with a recent Supreme Court 8-0 decision regarding owners property-rights in regard to temporary flooding of their lands. (The Tampa Tribune, December 5, 2012.) While flooding is not an issue with my property, I do see where the property-rights position of "taking" for which the constitution require compensation is relevant.

My concerns deal with three issues

#1 Water Run-off

Control of water run-off from the two properties adjacent to my property on the north needs to be fully addressed. The two homes facing Tapp Road directly west of Yonkers Street are slated for demolition to construct the approach to the Tapp Road overpass of I-69. The home at 3401 Tapp Road presents my greatest concern. This home's property directly flanks the footprint of my home. Also, the natural slope of this lot could direct run-off water into the foundation of my home. Currently, this is not a concern because the lot has been landscaped to direct water out onto the Yonkers curb. Also, Mr. Hancock has constructed a catch basin and drain line along the west side of his house to catch and direct water from the home adjacent to his on the west, around his home and then out to the Yonkers curb.

My concern is that in the construction and elevation of Tapp Road to create the overpass ramp; the 3401 lot's drainage pattern will be altered and the water run-off will flow onto my property and foundation.

The second home on Tapp Road to be removed, except for the east border, is less of a concern. Except for some 20 feet of the east border the remainder of this lot's water run-off flows southwest as it reaches my property and thus flows into the utility easement at the back of my property. But the east 20' border area of the lot has the potential to send water toward my foundation. The drainage pattern for this area needs to be modified to eliminate the potential problem.

Response:

Final design activities will address the specifics of the drainage design of reconstructed roadways associated with the I-69 Section 5 project.

PI097-02

Comment:

2 Traffic Noise

Lack of mechanisms to control traffic noise from both the Tapp Road ramp and the I-69 corridor will make living at the 2812 S. Yonkers Street residence intolerable.

I chose NOT to live directly on Tapp Road because I did not want to indure all the Tapp Road traffic noise. (Note: There was a house available on Tapp when I purchased the

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

Yonkers property and the less traffic noise was a factor in choosing the Yonker's home.) Currently the traffic noise from Tapp Road is disbursed by the existing structures facing Tapp Road. This disbursement is audibly perceptible by the volume observed at Mr. Hancock's home and that at mine on Yonkers. Without these current disbursement elements my volume will be significantly greater.

With the removal of all the homes on Tapp Road from the current State Road 37 through the planned homes west of the Yonkers Street intersection along with the raised road bed for the overpass ramp, I will be subjected to an unaltered broadcast of hundreds of feet of traffic noise. This noise will be amplified as traffic accelerates up the ramp and as traffic decelerates down the ramp. The effects of this traffic day and night will be intolerable. Unfortunately, I cannot see any mechanism to mask or disburse the noise.

The second source of sound pollution will be the constant drone of traffic noise emulating from I-69 traffic.

Due to the elevated position of my home on Yonkers Street, I will have a clear, direct, unobstructed view of I-69 traffic. Unfortunately, this direct line-of-sight path also means a direct unobstructed corridor for sound to penetrate my home.

At the presentation on December 6th, it was revealed that with the proposed sound barrier to be constructed, it will not be possible to extend the barrier north far enough to protect the direct line-on-sight sound corridor between I-69 and my home.

Thus my home is in the unfortunate position to be attacked by traffic noise from 180 degrees via Tapp Road and I-69.

I truly fear for my physical health due to the continuous, penetrating traffic noise. I will be subjected to traffic noise 24/7, 365 days a year. I have read about the effect of sleep deprivation on one's body and being in my 70's, I fear the health effects this disruptive intrusive situation will have on my life.

I truly do not believe I will be able to continue to live at my 2812 S. Yonkers Street home. I also believe this situation will have a significant effect on the property value of the house. I am retired and living on a limited income. I do not see how I will be able on my own to sell the Yonker's home at a reduced value and then purchase a similar replacement home in Bloomington. As to my house in Florida, it is a 26 year old mobile home, on a rental lot in a retirement park. It is an extremely modest retreat from the cold weather of Indiana, but not suitable as a year round home due to the high Florida summer sun and heat.

Response:

A preliminary noise barrier at this location was found to be both reasonable and feasible according to the INDOT *Traffic Noise Analysis Procedure* manual for residences on the west side of I-69 in this area. Barrier lengths, heights, and offsets are analyzed in detail as part of the FEIS. Barrier reasonableness and feasibility has also been updated during



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

this process. In the area of this residence, the barrier is proposed to be placed along I-69 and the southbound on-ramp from Tapp Road to I-69. Its terminus location along the ramp is preliminary. Final placement of the barrier terminus, assuming that it remains both feasible and reasonable, will be dependent on line-of-sight and safety in relation to the proximity of the barrier to the Tapp Road/I-69 southbound on-ramp intersection. This determination will be made in final design.

PI097-03 **Comment:**

#3 Loss of Aesthetics, Privacy and Community

I have lived in this home 30 years. My home is comfortable and I enjoy the current view from my new front bay windows. I enjoy the spirit of community offered by my neighbors. All of this will be destroyed by what is planned.

It should also be noted that this is all happening off my front door verses my back door. This is an in-my-face attack and will have a serious effect on my life.

In the past five years I have been upgrading my home via a new roof, new deck, new windows, new siding and refreshing the pest treatment. I HAD planned to begin on the inside this coming summer. This will NOT happen now.

Response:

Section 5.7 includes an analysis of visual and aesthetic impacts using an approach outlined in the *Visual Impact Assessment of Highway Projects* handbook from Federal Highway Administration (1998). Current corridor aesthetics in the vicinity of your neighborhood are currently considered more urban in nature with commercial, residential, and light industrial uses. Existing SR 37 is considered a partially controlled, limited access roadway.

With I-69 development, views of the road would continue to retain the more urban feel presently observed in the south portion of the corridor. New interchanges and overpasses such as at Tapp Road would become part of the urban landscape.

INDOT's policies include incorporating context sensitive solutions into development, construction, and maintenance of the State's transportation systems. Section 7.3.6, *Visual Impacts (Mitigation and Commitments)*, summarizes mitigation measures that will be used to address aesthetic and visual impacts associated with I-69 development.

PI097-04 **Comment:**

There is absolutely nothing good or positive I can find in what is happening to me due to I-69. I really need your serious consideration of my situation and consideration of some relief by the purchase of the 2812 S. Yonkers property.

**Response:**

Followup discussions with Mr. Cuttill were held on 4/29/13 and 6/25/13 in regards to his comments and concerns. This property is not identified as a potential displacement according to the FEIS analysis. Displacements and right-of-way purchases will be finalized in design. You may reach us in the Section 5 Project Office at 3802 Industrial Blvd., Unit 2, Bloomington, IN 47403 (812-355-1390) for more detailed discussion about your property.

PI098 **12/27/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Linda Goodwin

PI098-01 **Comment:**

I am writing concerning my house in Van Buren Park, Subsection 5B near the Wapehani Mountain Bike Park.

Right now my house is scheduled to be displaced with others in Van Buren Park. I understand that my house would not be displaced if the City of Bloomington allowed a 50-foot strip of park-land to be used by INDOT so that Highway 37 did not have to shift to the west near me and the Park.

I am writing to say I prefer to stay in my home and hope the City will allow use of this land. There are various reasons for this. One is that, because I still owe a significant amount of money on my home due to the need to refinance since my husband died, there is the worry I will not be able to afford to buy another house (or condo) I would like or need.

Second, change is hard for me, and due to my health problems and amount of work needed to move, it would be very stressful. Third, I have indoor/outdoor cats (have had and like dogs too) and it would change their surroundings. Fourth, I do not want to rent.

I realize the building of I69 in my backyard is not ideal either (i.e. the noise, building activity by workers, etc.) Also, that there will be change on Yonkers St. with houses displaced and blocking of Yonkers St. to overpass and I69 even if my house is spared.

So I will keep praying about this matter; and if I need to move, I hope I will get as much help as possible from INDOT, both financially and practically in moving and buying another place. But right now, I write to say again I prefer to stay where I'm at and have lived a long time since this is a possible option.

I hope my personal comments are of some help in the decision process, as stated in the Public Hearing papers it would cost less with the no-shift plan.



Response:

The referenced property is no longer considered a displacement. The Refined Preferred Alternative provides for use of some of the property in Wapehani Mountain Bike Park, thereby reducing residential impacts west of I-69.

PI099 **12/19/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)**
John Mehalechko, Hanna Properties

PI099-01 **Comment:**

Effected Property: 2536 W Industrial Dr. Retail Shopping Plaza (Alternative 8 Sheet 4)

By eliminating Vernal Pike/I-69 intersection, to reach us, traffic coming from the north or south on I-69 must exit at St. Rd. 46 or St. Rd. 48 and circle around to Curry Pike then to Vernal Pike and essentially come back east to I-69. This property in theory has moved 6 miles from its original location.

The income value of this property is based solely on its direct access to Bloomington's main thoroughfare St. Rd. 37/I-69. The property may become essentially useless for retail leasing, which is what it was built for in 2005.

I have already lost one lease renewal, based on eventually not being able to access the one major thoroughfare thru Bloomington 37/I-69. This continues to pop up in lease negotiations and talks with prospective lessors.

Without the suggested changes to the route proposal, I have outlined (Areas A-B-C-D) the property may become essentially useless for retail leasing, which again is what we built it for.

Although these proposed changes to (the Alternative 8 Sheet 4) in no way replace access to I-69, they would go a long way in reducing the lost income value if this property, and all businesses on W. Industrial Park Drive.

See attached map. [Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for copy of attached map.]

Area A) To provide a more direct access from north/south I-69. Put an access to Vernal Pike from the St.Rd. 46 ramp to I-69.

Area B) To keep the new Industrial Drive from overtaking the front yard 2536 and 2520 property. Route this section (hug) closer to I-69. The two entrances to 2536 will have less of a grade.

Area C) Widen railroad bridge to allow Industrial Dr. traffic to flow south without having to go 2 miles west to access Curry Pike.



Area D) Ties in with Area C put access road in from Whitehall Crossing Blvd. to W. Industrial Park Drive. To allow traffic to flow north & south from Vernal Pike to Whitehall Pike (3rd St.)

Response:

The I-69 Section 5 project office has been open since 2004 and alternative access plans have shown Vernal Pike as closed at I-69 with either an overpass or underpass since 2005. Alternative access plans for preliminary alternatives were presented at a Public Information Meeting in July 2005 (see meeting materials available at <http://www.i69indyevn.org/section-5/> under Public Information Meeting, July 2005 - Preliminary Alternatives; Maps – Alternative access plans containing a separate combination of interchanges overpasses and underpasses Alt. 1, Alt. 2, Alt. 3). Hanna Properties was also included in the 2012 Business Needs Surveys and information from these surveys have been considered as part of the EIS analysis.

With regard to points A) through C), modifying the existing SR 46 interchange to add the requested access is not included as part of this project. This area continues to be provided access by other roads connecting to Vernal Pike. The project will improve regional travel and accessibility for Southwest Indiana residents and businesses. This regional improvement in transportation accessibility could allow easier access for potential customers from outside the local area seeking to reach businesses in the Bloomington and Martinsville areas. With regard to point D), the road described is included in the current Bloomington/Monroe County MPO Long Range Plan.

PI100 12/9/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)
Lisa J. Kinder

PI100-01 Comment:

Sound barriers, I-69 and Oliver Winery/Windsor Private

Please consider including sound barriers for the Windsor Private homes and the Oliver Winery. Oliver Winery has developed over the past 40 years into a thriving business concern that attracts visitors to come to the Bloomington community. Part of that success is attributed to the tranquil park-like setting. I believe this environment must be not only protected from the noise that will result from I69 but also, I believe I69 can actually help Oliver Winery grow & prosper. An attractive barrier that helps block sound while also promoting the visual appeal of a relaxed park environment would encourage visitors to stop and patronize Oliver Winery. Please consider a sound barrier perhaps a natural berm planted with pines & dogwoods. Something that does not obstruct the view of the winery from I-69 but rather creates a pleasant view of the area while protecting the tranquil environment.

Response:

Please refer to PI049-01 response.



Additionally, in regards to the Oliver Winery, commercial retail businesses typically do not desire mitigation in the form of noise barriers because they desire the visibility and/or access. As a retail business, FHWA also does not assign a criteria level to these kinds of land uses (Category F) and no mitigation is required. Nonetheless, the site was classified as Category E (restaurant and/or bar) in recognition of its wine tasting events. However, this site is not predicted to meet the sound level criteria for a noise barrier for the Refined Preferred Alternative in the design year. As a result, mitigation is not warranted for this location. Additional information: the preliminary noise analysis indicated that the predicted Refined Preferred Alternative sound level will decrease over the design year no-build condition due to the highway shift to the west in this area.

PI101 **12/19/2012 Comment Form / Letter (Project Office)**
Marion Reeves, President, RevSport!, Inc.

PI101-01 **Comment:**

[12/19/2012 Comment Form]

Please see attachments

1. Comments
2. Map

[Attachment 1 – 12/19/2012 Letter]

After attending the "Effect on Industrial Park Drive Businesses" meeting today at the VFW Post, I would like to lend my support to these access ideas that were brought up by the business owners that attended. I believe these proposals will be a step in the right direction to address concerns about access to our businesses by customers, employees and for fire protection.

Proposals, map attached:

Starting at the traffic light at the SR 46 Interchange, connect the SR 46 to south 37 ramp to the above mentioned traffic light, then continuing onto the 37 south bound on-ramp, then onto a new access road running adjacent to I-69 all the way to Third Street. Industrial Park Drive and Vernal Pike would connect into this new access road.

This would give access for north bound I-69 by taking the SR 46 off ramp to the traffic light, turn left to exit onto the new access road. It would also give access for south bound I-69 by taking the SR 46 off ramp to the traffic light and onto the new access road. Connecting the new access road into Vernal Pike would give access from the east and west sides of I-69 via the planned Vernal Pike/17th Street proposed overpass.

Continuing the new access road to Third Street would give vital access from this key area, including quick response from the Third Street Fire Station. This would be more cost effective over crossing the railroad behind Kohl's, since by the map you are already proposing "CSX Railroad reconstruct underpass", you could just add an extra lane



crossing over the railroad for the new access road, since you are reconstructing this area anyway.

The new access road could be one-way from the traffic light at SR 46 to Vernal Pike and then two-way from Vernal Pike to Third Street giving better access to the Industrial Park for fire protection from the Third Street Fire Station.

Response:

Please refer to PI099-01 response.

PI101-02 Comment:

We would also like to have business name signs at the I-69 to SR 46 south and north off-ramps, at the SR 46 traffic light, at Vernal Pike and at Third Street. At this meeting we were told that was handled by Indiana Logo, are these signs planned by them or by your office? Who should we contact and when?

Response:

Please refer to PI047-04 response.

PI101-03 Comment:

Concerning the Wapahani Mountain Bike Park, I favor the option of using the proposed fifty feet of the park. The trail could be set back and rerouted so I-69 does not have to be shifted.

Comment:

Please refer to PI011-01 response.

**PI102 12/31/2012 E-mail (I-69)
Elizabeth Thompson, Thompson Furniture**

PI102-01 Comment:

We are very concerned about Section 5 and its impact on our business, Thompson Furniture. Based on the plans presented on December 6, 2012 INDOT is planning to "displace" our smaller store on Wayport Road to make room for the frontage road. This was our initial flagship store and provides us with additional square footage which will be hard to replace, in addition to being in a high traffic area. We found out about the displacement through the newspaper at the same time we were advertising in the same paper a remodeling sale at this site. We have done considerable work to the site in addition to the advertising related to this site over the past 17 years. This will have a huge impact on our business, as people are already asking when we are going out of business, which hurts at both of our locations. Our second location on Highway 37 North is slated to lose considerable value, if not all its value as a retail location due to the placement of the frontage road and access to it based on the plan as presented. The



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

plan shows our customers from the south driving past our location approximately 2 miles to exit onto Sample Road, then backtracking to our location, approximately 2 miles or more, just to reach us. Research shows and experience proves, this inconvenience and difficulty in access, will deter business and we foresee it definitely hurting our business if not hurting it to the point of closing. The total round trip would be between 8 and 10 miles out of the way.

Response:

INDOT's policies for relocations are governed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 ("Uniform Act" – Public Law 91-646), as amended in 1987. INDOT will take required actions to ensure fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of this project. A relocation agent will be assigned to this project in advance of acquisition to ascertain the needs and desires of the potentially displaced persons to provide information, answer questions, and give help in finding replacement property. Displacements and right-of-way purchases will be finalized in design. You may reach us in the Section 5 Project Office at 3802 Industrial Blvd., Unit 2, Bloomington, IN 47403 (812-355-1390) for more detailed discussion about your properties.

In regards to the second location along Highway 37 North, Section 5.3.4, *Travel Patterns and Accessibility*, identifies changes in local travel patterns. While local access modifications would occur as a result of I-69 development, the purpose of I-69, as defined in the Tier 1 FEIS, is to provide improved transportation linkages between Evansville and Indianapolis. The project will improve regional travel and accessibility for Southwest Indiana residents and businesses. This regional improvement in transportation accessibility could allow easier access for potential customers from outside the local area seeking to reach businesses in the Bloomington and Martinsville areas. It also will provide improved access to business suppliers from outside the local area.

PI102-02 Comment:

Access by emergency vehicles would be hindered in the same way, greatly increasing response time. The present location of our emergency responders would result in several miles of additional travel out of the way to either access I-69 or the frontage road, to respond to our location.

Response:

Please refer to LG001-02 response.

PI102-03 Comment:

We have extensive investment in our advertising of both locations, including newspaper, radio, yellow pages and billboards (which will all have to be replaced with new directions) and miscellaneous other sources.



Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to PI047-04 response. In general, advertising can be updated as part of the normal course of doing business because of the length of time associated with constructing the project. You may reach us in the Section 5 Project Office at 3802 Industrial Blvd., Unit 2, Bloomington, IN 47403 (812-355-1390) to obtain the most up-to-date information available whenever planning updates for advertising.

PI102-04

Comment:

The plan shows a cul de sac next to this location, but does not account for the need for 53 foot semitrailers to turn around and access our loading dock area. We have as many as three semis arrive at a time, in addition to customers, and the plan does not address this issue. In addition, how the parking at this location will be affected is unknown, as is the ability for semitrailers to deliver easily to the building. The plan in general will certainly put us out of one location, and greatly affect or destroy business at our other location. If the access road connected at the College Avenue overpass or interchange, depending on what is decided, at least that would give the building on highway 37 a fighting chance, As it stands now, we perceive the road probably will put us out of business.

Response:

The Refined Preferred Alternative continues to provide for a west-side access road which connects Chuck Taylor Road to Sample Road. Review of internal traffic patterns and the appropriate sizing of access features (including cul-de-sacs) will be evaluated further as part of the final design.



PI103 **12/31/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Stephanie Ems-McClung

PI103-01 **Comment:**

Hello I am a home owner in Van Buren Park and I'm commenting on the 2 proposals surrounding the Tapp Rd and 2nd St interchanges. I would like to state that the preferred route (sheet A) is an excess and inefficient use of tax payers money to protect a small portion of a public park that in the end will not lose use of the land. This route will spend an extra \$5.4 million of tax payers hard earned money in an already tough economy, will cause excessive disruption of traffic to redo the 2nd St bridge and to move the highway 55 feet west, and not to mention disruption to Van Buren residents for having to move major utilities consisting of a gas main and power corridor. Furthermore, this route will likely cause the displacement of an additional 7 families in the Van Buren neighborhood. While the preferred route A causes more disruption and confiscation to our property than route B (we are not one of the planned displaced homes), I feel much more strongly that route A is financially irresponsible to the public and to the neighborhood as a whole than to our personal property. Thank you for taking my comments seriously as I think I69 will be a benefit to the community.

Response:

Please refer to PI011-01 response.

PI104 **12/30/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Dan and Marybeth Salmon

PI104-01 **Comment:**

We live at 4080 State Rd. 37 South, Martinsville. If you are looking at the Tier 2 Studies-Section 5- SR37 to SR39, Alternative 8 (Indot's Preferred Alternative) Map-sheet 14 of 16. We live two lots south of the New Testament Baptist Church. Both the Proposed Local access road and the Alternative preferred road will go over our well, and both roads would also go through our septic field These two concerns would not allow us to function in our home. These two planed roads will also leave us very little front yard. With all of our concerns we strongly appeal to you to buy our home. We would greatly appreciate a reply to this comment so we know you have received this message. Concerned Home Owners, Dan and Marybeth Salmon

**Response:**

An automated notice of receipt was issued in response to this email. Additionally, INDOT is instituting “Kitchen Table Meetings” with potentially affected property owners to afford an opportunity to convey specific information about their properties to the design team. A kitchen table meeting was held with the Salmon’s on June 6, 2013. As with all properties identified as potential displacements in the FEIS, displacements and right-of-way purchases will be finalized in design. Generally, loss of a property’s wells and/or septic fields would result in a displacement; the final design on this property will determine whether such impacts will occur.

PI105 **12/29/2012 E-mail (I-69)**
Felice Cloyd

PI105-01 **Comment:**

I live in Van Buren Subdivision near Tapp Rd and hwy 37 in section 5 of the proposed I 69. There is a proposed overpass at that intersection. I would like to see that overpass have a pedestrian and bike path. Just down the road on Tapp road is the Clear Creek trail-a multipurpose path. If there is a bicycle and pedestrian path on this overpass than those of us living on the west side of 37/69 will be able to make use of that trail. This will really open up the possibilities for many people to use a bike or walk to the trail with out having to worry about getting hit by a car. This would be so much safer!

Response:

At Tapp Road, a sidewalk (south side) and multi-use path (north side) is included across I-69. See Section 7.3.2, *Social and Neighborhood*, Table 7-2 for a listing of other pedestrian and bicycle-related commitments included in the project.

PI106 **12/26/2012 E-mail (I-69) / E-mail (INDOT)**
Thomas Ahler

PI106-01 **Comment:**

I want to submit my comments for Interstate 69 Section 5 DEIS.

Currently, the partial interchange at Indiana State Road 37 and North Walnut St. in Monroe County provides limited access for residents who live in the area north of the City of Bloomington.

Interstate 69 having a full interchange at North Walnut St. will provide greater access to that area.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-46 response.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

PI106-02 Comment:

Hopefully, the entire Interstate 69 route between Evansville and Indianapolis will be completed and open to traffic between 2020 - 2022

Response:

Please refer to AF002-23 response.

**PI107 1/2/2013 Comment Form (Project Office)
Sharon R. Cooksey**

PI107-01 Comment:

Subject: Cooksey Lane

Alternative 8 proposes displacement of all residents of this area. We, the property owners, wish to propose our idea, as shown on the attached sketch.

Proposal:

Build a service road to run parallel to 37/69 from Cooksey Lane to Pine Boulevard, approx. one mile. This would eliminate the displacement of 11 families and minimize travel time to Godsey Road Exchange.

[Referenced sketch is included with Charles Wm. Cooksey Comment PI091 as he is the one who provided it.]

Response:

Please refer to PI085-01 response.

**PI108 1/2/2013 Comment Form (Project Office)
R. Elaine Culp**

PI108-01 Comment:

Alternative 8 proposes to displace all residents of this area. There are about 60 acres in Morgan County with 5 residences; 4 homes, 1 trailer and 3 barns on Cooksey Lane. In Monroe County 1 trailer and approximately 65 acres; most of the acreage is farm land. This proposal will cause this land to not have an exit or entrance.

We believe that a road that would run parallel to SR 37 from Cooksey Lane to Pine Boulevard would be less expensive than buying all the land, property and timber.

Response:

Please refer to PI085-01 response.



PI109 **1/2/2013 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Jeff Hanna

PI109-01 **Comment:**

- In favor of taking part of Wapehani Park for section south of 2nd Street.

Response:

Please refer to PI011-01 response.

PI109-02 **Comment**

- In favor of major interchange at the present ramp a Walnut St. on north side. At least maintaining what we have with up grades.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-46 response.

PI109-03 **Comment:**

- Vernal Pike needs a better access in at least. The proposed will be a nightmare.

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for copy of sketch included with comment.]

Response:

Please refer to AF002-23 and PI099-01 responses.

PI109-04 **Comment:**

- Sample Rd. interchange is a waste.

Response:

The Refined Preferred Alternative includes the interchange at Sample Road to provide access to the interstate for many residences and business in the northern Monroe County. The interchange at Sample Road is the only interchange in the Refined Preferred Alternative between Walnut Street near Bloomington and Liberty Church Road near Martinsville, a distance of about 10 miles.



PI110 **1/2/2013 Letter (Project Office)**
Richard A. Martin

PI110-01 **Comment:**

With only a brief review of the lengthy Section 5 DEIS document, I submit the following comments regarding the DEIS in general and Alternative 8 in particular. In summary, I believe the proposed alternative is short-sighted and short-changes Monroe County in response to impacts this new Interstate will have on the community. Design decisions are clearly motivated by minimizing cost at the expense of quality, suitability, and durability for the long-term. We would not have built this highway according to the preferred alternative specification 10 years ago when it was conceived and we should not be building it this way now.

A.) General concerns:

1.) Exhausting the existing SR 37 ROW --

While using the existing SR 37 right-of-way is laudable, using up the existing corridor is shortsighted. One of the significant failings of interstate planning as now performed by INDOT and FHWA is the establishment of a 20 year planning horizon done in a manner that does not accommodate expectations beyond that horizon. This approach is a perversion of system lifecycle design practice that can only lead to far more expensive remediation of future problematic situations.

Such a practice is appropriate in situations where the facility is expected to be decommissioned by the time the plan interval expires, i.e. the system plan horizon is the entire lifecycle of the facility, or where demand for facility use can be demonstrated to never exceed the horizon forecast. Neither of those situations exists for an interstate facility that will be operationally sustained for the indefinite future.

Failing to acknowledge expanded facility use beyond the horizon can only result in excessive future cost to acquire right-of-way for expansion, either by expanding the existing corridor or by establishing a new corridor. Consider how different our situation would be if the current SR 37 corridor did not have capacity for additional travel lanes. Even more important are the expansion needs of interchanges as traffic increases. Future free flow interchange designs necessary to accommodate expected urban traffic increases beyond the 20 year horizon will be very expensive and the prior failure to acquire the necessary ROW is even now limiting current design alternatives.

Given our terrain, as highlighted in the Tier 1 study, there are no other corridor opportunities of this magnitude in Monroe County. Failing to properly size the corridor now, especially the interchange areas, for a sustainable future will result in a failed interstate network segment beyond the current plan horizon. Establishing a plan horizon for sustainable systems does not mean we can ignore system demand growth and response capability after the current horizon is reached.

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

On December 19 at a Chamber of Commerce sponsored meeting, Sam Sarvis asked if we wanted to increase capacity by outward expansion or inward use of the existing median. The question was asked in the context of a discussion of median as grassy strip or concrete barrier. Those present generally favored the grassy median for aesthetic reasons but were concerned about a lack of information concerning the actual impact on existing structures. The critical issues is not a question of grass or no grass, it is a question of future capacity to deal with a growing community and the primary north/south travel corridor. Too often the major policy decisions are hidden by technical questions that assume a particular policy. I have serious concerns regarding the policy initiative to sacrifice future capacity and quality for short-term cost reduction. Our community will be poorly served by this policy.

Response:

The Refined Preferred Alternative includes the re-use of the existing two lanes, with an additional third lane added to the existing median, which minimizes impacts to surrounding natural resources, homes and businesses, as well as cost. This alternative also includes the paving of the remaining median to be used as a paved shoulder through urban Bloomington. The need for capacity of the third lane in Bloomington is not anticipated until sometime after the year 2025 (see Appendix TT, *3rd Lane Analysis Memorandum*); 2035 is the design year for this environmental study. Interchanges are also evaluated to meet capacity needs through the 2035 design year. Additionally, INDOT has worked with local planning organizations for the Section 5 project through the Participating Agency process; these agencies can incorporate development setbacks in planning for needs beyond the current plan horizon.

PI110-02**Comment:**

2.) Free flow ingress/egress at major interchanges --

As identified in the options for major interchanges in Monroe County, including the 'preferred alternative', no free flow opportunity exists for a left turn onto I-69. All left turn movements onto the interstate in urban areas will require traversing two signals, one approaching the bridge and another at the left turn point. The draft does mention a single point interchange design alternative but indicates signal delays are longer at a single point interchange and none are planned, except possibly at North Walnut Street. The 'preferred alternative' would even remove the north side existing entrance/exit loop pair at 2nd Street.

We are already experiencing peak hour congestion at the 3rd and 2nd street SR 37 intersections caused by the traffic signal delays at short distances. We cannot expect this congestion to be reduced by more interstate traffic using either the existing intersections or those proposed by the 'preferred alternative'. The implementation of our local comprehensive plans expects traffic flow through these critical intersections to be hassle-free for motorists so that residing west of I-69 is not perceived as a significant liability.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

The SR 46 interchange is likely to see the most change over time because of access to Indiana University, our largest employer, to the North Park development, probable location of a future hospital complex, and to the northwestern portion of Monroe County where residential growth around Ellettsville will continue to be significant. None of the current alternatives upgrades that intersection to provide free flow for left turns south or north from SR 46. Now is the time to provide those opportunities in an area already planned for major economic development activities.

I understand the desire to complete Section 5 at minimum cost to taxpayers. However, shifting the burden of cost to local residents and businesses does not promote economic development for us -- it simply drains resources for years to come as we ameliorate the impacts of spending too little up front.

Response:

While none of the interchanges provided in the Refined Preferred Alternative include a free-flow left turn movement onto I-69, all interchanges operate at an acceptable LOS up to and through the design year (2035). These designs are typical of urban freeway interchanges throughout Indiana; interchanges which allow for free-flow designs such as those described in the comment are atypical, and generally provided where there are location-specific issues related to interchange capacity and its relationship to turning movement. During the final design, signal timing and the potential for synchronizing the interchange signals with adjacent signals on state and local facilities will be reviewed to provide the most efficient network possible.

PI110-03

Comment:

3.) Traffic modeling per Annex GG --

Annex GG states that the methods utilized result in mean square errors of 50% to 60% for collector roads and local roads in rural and study urban areas, indicating that the traffic model offers little assurance of traffic load on any of these roadways going forward. (MAPE values are more encouraging for rural areas but less so for urban areas.) Lacking that assurance, the impact of road closures and shifting traffic loads is essentially unknown and speculative at best. In addition, Annex GG states that truck traffic data was implied rather than counted and that only daily traffic assignments were produced. Peak load data was not used or projected, which may account for the lack of attention to current congestion at peak hours for the SR 45 and SR 48 intersections with SR 37.



Response:

The I-69 corridor model is a regional travel model.³ Its purpose is to compare regional travel flows which affect decisions regarding alternatives for the I-69 project. These decisions include the location and necessary capacity for interchanges, and the location of grade separations (overpasses and underpasses). As such, its error statistics for higher classification roads demonstrate that it is an appropriate tool for these purposes. The Mean Absolute Percentage Error (MAPE)⁴ for all freeways, principal arterials, and minor arterials range from 5.9% to 28.2%.

The regional travel model used in the FEIS has been updated. It incorporates recent truck counts. It also produces peak hour assignments, in addition to the daily assignments provided in the DEIS (see FEIS Appendix GG, *I-69 Corridor Model Documentation*).

In addition, a more detailed analysis using microsimulation forecasts for the Refined Preferred Alternative are provided in this FEIS. This analysis, using the TransModeler simulation tool, models individual vehicle interaction and actual driver behavior, and is better suited to analyzing the detailed issues cited in this comment. It also models the interaction of roadways within the interchanges and other nearby roadways. This analysis determined that the proposed interchange designs for the Revised Preferred Alternative provide an acceptable Level of Service (LOS) in the forecast year. See FEIS Section 5.6, *Traffic Impacts*, and Appendix SS, *Traffic Simulation Modeling Summary*, for further information.

While the corridor model can be informative regarding travel on local streets, as a regional model it is not a suitable tool for predicting local travel, especially on lower classification roads (collectors and local roads). Bloomington (as well as other MPOs around the state) maintain local travel forecasting models which are the appropriate tool to forecast local travel. INDOT continues to work closely with the BMCMPPO and City of Bloomington to coordinate on these and other local issues.

PI110-04 Comment:

B.) Specific concerns:

- 1.) Fullerton Pike and TIF support --

At the Fullerton Pike interchange, previous alternatives consumed land on the southeast corner of the intersection that is included in the Fullerton Pike TIF area. This TIF was

³ The corridor model area includes all of Monroe, Morgan, Johnson, and Marion counties; most of Hamilton and Hendricks counties, and portion of Boone, Madison, Hancock, Shelby, Browne, Lawrence, Greene, Owen and Putnam counties. See FEIS Figure 3-5.

⁴ MAPE is representative of the absolute error in forecasted versus observed traffic volumes based goodness-of-fit statistics. See Appendix GG, pgs. 95-96 for a detailed description.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

created to enable funding for planning of a major improvement to east-west traffic flow at the south edge of Bloomington that would connect Fullerton Pike, Gordon Pike, and Rhorer Road into a continuous roadway with expanded capacity. The TIF was not considered sufficient to construct the project but would provide funds for planning and engineering in the near term in expectation of a major commitment from the I-69 project associated with the new interchange at Fullerton Pike.

Having taken the initiative, we now find that the extent of the I-69 commitment is scaled back under the justification that Monroe County has created a TIF to accomplish that task and I-69 project support is no longer needed. Nothing could be further from the truth. Monroe County is not going to be able to complete this project without Federal and State funding. Removing the I-69 participation may well eliminate the project as a viable opportunity. Improving Fullerton Pike to Rockport Road only exacerbates the inadequacy of access to Bloomington from the southwest portion of the county going forward, resulting in the expenditure of additional local tax revenue to upgrade roadways. Until we complete the BMCMPPO Long-Range Transportation Plan update, the roadway infrastructure in this area is uncertain.

And to add insult to injury, many of the interchange alternatives remove land from the TIF that could generate some of the very funds so essential to the continuation of this effort by Monroe County. An earlier draft did identify an interchange as part of Alternative 5 that provides the most support for the Fullerton Pike project by placing the ramps on the north side of Fullerton Pike with an intersection on the east side of I-69 at a location suitable for extension across the road into the TIF area. Among the alternatives this interchange configuration does the most to support development of the TIF area and thereby provide support for the entire Fullerton Pike project.

The 'preferred alternative' actually removes about 2/3 of the most desirable parcel in the TIF from development. Without TIF support it is doubtful that the southern thoroughfare will be constructed in the next 20 years. The project is too expensive for local resources or a major share of matching funds given other needs.

The 'preferred alternative' bridge structure and approaches at Fullerton Pike consume more land and existing home and businesses than necessary. Lowering the mainline surface a few feet would allow a shorter west end approach distance and save 4 homes, 1 church and a half-dozen businesses from relocating. (Here as elsewhere, the expense of mainline roadbed modification to accommodate the local situation for residents and businesses is considered excessive when compared to the value of those other entities. Such an analysis is another perversion of system design trade-off decision-making where inadequate evaluation techniques lead to pre-determined results.) Lowering the bridge height also improves the east end approach modifications necessary on Fullerton Pike.

Response:

Please refer to PI046-03 response. The Fullerton Pike interchange design in the Refined Preferred Alternative needs to address multiple environmental constraints. These include avoiding and minimizing impacts to karst features in the area, the North Clear

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

Creek Historic Landscape District and Monroe Hospital. As part of the Section 106 process for this project, the North Clear Creek Historic Landscape District has been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Note that the configuration included in Alternative 5 of the DEIS did include ramp access on the east side of the road in the northern quadrant only; however it also included a shift of the I-69 mainline east of the existing SR 37 corridor, which had significant additional impacts and costs. Interchange configuration will be finalized during final design.

PI110-05 Comment:

2.) The kluge at Tapp and 2nd --

While I appreciate the need for proper spacing of interchanges on high-speed interstates, the lack of sufficient space for interchanges that would otherwise be necessary to support existing traffic loads should not result in suboptimal solutions. The split diamond approach may meet the technical requirements as a means to serve traffic on both Tapp Road and 2nd Street but it fails to meet a common sense usability criterion for motorists. A 'preferred alternative' option for this intersection complex closes three roads and consumes 33 residential properties. This is an unacceptable loss to our community when other options exist.

We could take the same funds and provide better connectivity and usefulness by modifying Leonard Springs Road, location of recent interest in pedestrian safety, and Weimer Road to be fully functioning collectors for the same north-south traffic with elimination of the Tapp Road interchange component, saving about two dozen homes, while still adding a Tapp Road overpass. Unfortunately, this option is unlikely because of the closed corridor approach to the design of the I-69 corridor. Again, narrowing design options prematurely results in far less than optimal choices and the better solutions to adequate interstate access and impact mitigation are hindered by the constraints of I-69 conceptualization.

This split diamond alternative means that a northbound motorist exiting I-69 for Walmart will need to negotiate 3 stoplights before exiting the interchange and a southbound motorist exiting I-69 for a medical clinic on Tapp Road also will need to negotiate 3 stoplights before exiting the interchange. At present, both motorists encounter 1 stoplight on the same trip.

Obstacles like these imposed on existing routes are the reason why motorists modify travel patterns to avoid interstate induced congestion. Now, the primary use of SR 37 is local traffic. As that corridor becomes more difficult to negotiate, motorists will seek other routes even if the route consumes nominally more time, again placing additional burdens on local roads for which the community has little response capability. I have already mentioned that the traffic modeling approach does a poor job of predicting traffic on collector and local roads proximate to the I-69 corridor.



Response:

A split diamond interchange is a widely accepted interchange type, used throughout Indiana and across the country. It is particularly useful in urban areas where access needs resulting from local development would otherwise violate interchange spacing guidelines. During the final design process, signing requirements for this interchange will be identified and incorporated into the construction plans. Please also refer to PI110-02 and PI110-03 responses.

SR 37 is a principal arterial road; once it is upgraded to I-69, it will continue to serve as part of the principal arterial system. The *Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (4th Edition)* published by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials defines the urban principal arterial system as follows: “The principal arterial system carries most of the trips entering and leaving the urban area, as well as most of the through movements bypassing the central city. In addition, significant intra-area travel, such as between central business districts and outlying residential areas, between major inner-city communities, and between major suburban centers, is served by this class of facility.” Neither SR 37 nor I-69 serve primarily local traffic. The design of I-69, like the design of existing SR 37, conforms to its function as part of the principal arterial system in this region.

PI110-06

Comment:

The 2nd Street intersection must accommodate bicycle and pedestrians, preferably on the south side of the interchange. Safety at this intersection for these modes of travel must occur. Many of us have witnessed families with strollers negotiating the road side to cross SR37 in heavy traffic - pedestrian use is common and a failure to safely accommodate that traffic as part of any I-69 construction is unacceptable.

Response:

Please refer to PI046-02 response.

PI110-07

Comment:

3.) 3rd Street bridge --

This bridge should be rebuilt or retro-fitted with bicycle and pedestrian accommodation but few options appear to exist. An interesting trade-off is found for the intersection where 8 homes on the west side of I-69 will be removed unless the City of Bloomington agrees to placing about 50 feet of the Wapahani Bicycle Park into the interstate ROW, thus allowing the 3rd Street to remain as is, i.e. providing no bicycle and pedestrian accommodation. So, by sacrificing the homes and retaining the park land we can get a new bridge and perhaps bicycle/pedestrian accommodation. We need an alternative that saves the homes and provides bicycle/pedestrian accommodation east-west at the interchange. The adequacy of Section 5 for the next 20 years is already doubtful from many perspectives, particularly those utilizing alternative modes of transportation. Rather than enhancing the corridor capacity of local east-west traffic, including non-



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

automobile modes, the 'preferred alternative' further restricts east-west movement by forcing vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians to a few interchange locations.

Response:

Please refer to PI046-02 response regarding pedestrian and bicycle access. Please refer to PI011-01 response regarding Wapehani Mountain Bike Park.

PI110-08

Comment:

4.) Gates drive access --

While we have always been under the impression that the SR 37 access to the Whitehall Crossing shopping center was temporary, we also have been under the impression that its presence has significantly reduced traffic load at the intersection of 3rd Street and Gates Drive. Our expectation has been that this access to SR 37 could be replaced with a direct connection of Gates Drive to Industrial Boulevard and improved free flow movement from SR 37 to Gates Drive along 3rd Street. Unfortunately, the screening alternatives simply eliminate a useful traffic access point that reduces congestion and then fail to mitigate the induced traffic congestion elsewhere.

I have been unable to find any information in the DEIS regarding the impact of closing the Whitehall Crossing SR 37 access. What is the usage now and where will those vehicles be accommodated? Are you simply assuming that traffic displacement will shift to 3rd Street, increasing the burden already evident for that roadway?

Response:

All projects from the local BMCMPPO's Long Range Plan (LRP) are included in the I-69 Traffic Model to represent the future no build condition for the EIS analysis. The SR 37 West Frontage Road from SR 48 to SR 46 is included in the LRP as a Monroe County/Town of Ellettsville project. As noted in the LRP, this and other listed "major transportation investments are essential in addressing such issues as alleviation of traffic congestion, improvements to street connectivity, upgrades to roadway safety, and improvements for bicycle and pedestrian accessibility and commuting." It is independent of the I-69 project.

In the FEIS, traffic studies of the Refined Preferred Alternative were taken to a higher level of detail using traffic microsimulation. This analysis in the area of the 3rd Street interchange included all intersections between Curry Pike on the west and Franklin Rd./Wynndale Dr. on the east. This includes the Gates Drive entrance/exit. The traffic microsimulation analysis showed acceptable operations at the Gates Drive location on SR 48. See FEIS Section 5.6, *Traffic Impacts*, and Appendix SS, *Traffic Model Simulation Summary*, for more information.

PI110-09

Comment:

5.) Vernal Pike --



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

This SR 37 intersection is consistently among the highest accident intersections in Monroe County. It is specifically identified as having an increased risk potential by the Tier 2 Section 4 FEIS. It is a major access point along SR 37 that must close because of the interchange distance criteria for interstates. But traffic along Vernal Pike cannot be eliminated because of the large service area for this collector roadway. Two bridging alternatives are presented in the DEIS- one over and one under I-69. Either of these structures present difficult challenges. An underpass is likely to encounter significant stone deposits and would require an extension of 17th street and upgrade of the connection to the existing Vernal Pike or extensive modification of Vernal Pike and service to property that includes the Lemon Lane site. The underpass may retain more homes than the overpass but the eastern approach is limited by recent development along 17th Street. The overpass has a steep gradient on the west approach, reaching the county road standard of 8%. This grade on a significant east-west roadway will encumber extra winter clearing efforts, particularly since the State Police Post will need to traverse this grade. Given the urgency to mitigate the increased risk at the SR 37 intersection after Section 4 opens, the replacement of this intersection with overpass or underpass must be the highest priority for Section 5 construction. The 'preferred alternative' overpass seems appropriate although lowering the mainline roadbed to reduce bridge height and extending the approach further to the west could lower the grade for improved winter use and be more user friendly for trucks in this industrial employment area.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-23 response.

PI110-10

Comment:

6.) INDOT Garage and Acuff Road --

Does the INDOT Garage access to I-69 remain? If so where are the decal/accel lanes accommodated? Is a cross-over provided? Where are the Acuff Road cul-de-sacs to be located?

7.) Kinser Pike and North Walnut --

During the Tier 1 studies, Monroe County and the City of Bloomington carefully examined the alternatives for interchanges at both Kinser Pike and North Walnut Street. Both are now served by access to SR 37 although the use of the Kinser Pike intersection is much less than North Walnut Street.

Kinser Pike is a favored bicycle route leading into the Bean-Blossom bottoms and northwestern Monroe County. On the east side of that SR 37 intersection the City of Bloomington had identified an employment area opportunity and even authorized sanitary sewer for the area but has seen far more residential development than commercial development as a result. On the west side of the intersection is sparse residential development with little opportunity for more development because of the terrain. In addition, the Maple Grove Historic District lies to the west across Stouts

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

Creek. The 'preferred alternative' provides an overpass for Kinser Pike. However, the improvements beyond the west approach extend beyond the structure over ¼ mile, consuming 2 additional residences. I am unable to find evidence supporting this extended work on Kinser Pike. Why is it warranted? Does it have something to do with the partial interchange option at North Walnut Street or the new bridge on Bottom Road (#45)? If so, can it be eliminated if a full interchange or other satisfactory Bottom Road access from I-69 is provided?

The North Walnut Street SR 37 access is the gateway to Bloomington with North Walnut Street being the primary point of access to the north side of town and Old SR 37 connecting to Bethel Lane going east to New Unionville and SR 45. There is not a comparable access to eastern Monroe County from Kinser Pike. By placing the 'preferred alternative' option full eastwest/ north-south interchange at North Walnut Street current access is maintained and an opportunity to enhance connectivity along Maple Grove Road to the north side of Ellettsville is gained. Otherwise all Ellettsville traffic heading north on I-69 must use the left turn lane at SR 46 or travel north on several county roads to the Sample Road interchange. The full interchange option retains the gateway to Bloomington and provides access both east, via Old SR 37 and Bethel Lane, and west, via an enhanced Maple Grove Road and Bottom Road connection. Using the North Walnut Street interchange alternative does require improvement of West Bayles Road to provide safe connectivity with Kinser Pike -- another future local expense unless included as a necessary consequence of the North Walnut interchange location and funded as part of that interchange.

Another possible resolution to provide adequate east-west travel and sewage treatment plant access for septage haulers is to upgrade Sample Road west of its proposed I-69 intersection to provide direct access to Bottom Road near Maple Grove Road. Monroe County acquired a critical ROW for this connection several years ago but is unable to fund that project. With the new interchange a Sample Road, the connection to Bottom Road would provide a viable opportunity for interstate access while retaining east-west connectivity. The North Walnut partial interchange could continue to service local traffic bound to and from Indiana University and neighborhoods on the north side of Bloomington.

Response:

Please refer to LG001-03 response regarding access issues west of I-69 in this area. In the Refined Preferred Alternative, access to the INDOT Bloomington Subdistrict will be from Prow Road. Acuff Road would be closed at I-69. Cul-de-sacs are not proposed at Acuff Road. On the east side, pavement on Acuff Road would be removed between I-69 and Prow Road. Specific design features will be determined in final design.

Please refer to AF002-46 regarding the Walnut Street interchange design. The additional impacts along Kinser Pike north of the overpass over I-69 are needed to allow it to serve as a local access road with adequate geometric features; similar impacts are associated with Alternative 5, which includes a Kinser Pike interchange. These impacts on Kinser Pike are not related to the provision of an interchange at Walnut Street.



PI110-11

Comment:

8.) Access roads for northern Monroe County --

The existing ROW use for frontage roads across the Bean-Blossom valley and north through Monroe County is equivalent to the consumption of the ROW through Bloomington and results in the same concern for long-term viability of the corridor as the sole route. Because of the terrain, we have very few north-south roads in northern Monroe County. Fortunately we have relatively sparse population in northern Monroe County as well but the ridge top occupied by SR 37 is the most heavily populated and can be expected to increase in development intensity within the next 20 years. This corridor also has significant commercial use. With Sample Road as the only crossover point in the 7 miles between North Walnut Street and the county line, all of the traffic generated by these properties must use the frontage roads and for some, travel many extra miles each east-west trip.

The specific configuration of the frontage roads also places traffic going in opposite directions separated by a concrete barrier. While this situation is similar to most collector and arterial road traffic, the speed differential and on-coming traffic on both left and right will result in distinctly different driving conditions. Local regular users of this frontage road configuration will adjust to the resulting pattern but new users may find the situation alarming and confusing.

The reduced travel lane and shoulder width on these adjacent access roads increase risks of accidents. Where is the trade study analyzing the trade-off between cost of construction and value of losses resulting from induced accidents over the plan horizon?

Why does the west access road extend over 1 mile south of the Sample Road interchange to service only two businesses and a home site when most of the homes are removed to make way for the access road in the first place? Access to Griffith Cemetery should not be a multi-million dollar expense for tax payers. The same questionable service is found in the east side where connectivity from Showers Road north is provided to the interchange but the homes along the route are removed. What purpose does building an access road for removed homes serve? Wylie connects to Old SR37 and back to Sample Road less than a mile north.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-02 regarding the minimization of impacts in this section of the project and access road design. The local access roads south of Sample Road serve multiple existing parcels. As part of Refined Preferred Alternative 8, segments of these local access roads have been revised to make use of portions of the existing local roadway network to further minimize the number of potential displacements.

Griffith Cemetery must either have access maintained or it would be considered for acquisition, as is required for any other property. In the case of cemeteries and the review of access costs versus acquisition costs, acquisition costs would need to include

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

the costs to purchase a replacement site for the cemetery, as well as the costs to remove and reinter the existing graves.

Please note that the final determinations about access, including which properties are acquired, will take place as part of the final design process. All parts of the project, including local access roads, will be designed to satisfy the Indiana Design Manual, which provides guidance as to what constitutes a safe facility. The IDM's requirements specify what constitutes safe roadway configurations (travel lane, shoulder width, etc.) and posted speeds. Travel lanes on local access roads which are adjacent to I-69 will be separated by 60 feet from travel lanes on I-69 unless a guardrail or barrier is provided. See FEIS Figure 3.8 for a graphic displaying this typical roadway section.

PI110-12 Comment:

9.) 5% grade --

During the final review of Section 4 the issue of 5% grade alternatives was thoroughly examined and ultimately rejected because the study cited as justification was found to be mis-represented in the report. A similar finding must be identified for Section 5 and therefore the only justification for 5% grade in any I-69 Section is simply construction cost. Apparently the added cost of fuel over the plan horizon required to be consumed because of the steeper grade is not to be considered as a public expense. This trade-off of current public construction expense for longterm fuel expense for the public should be a factor in the decision process, as should the increased emissions from engines under more stress climbing the steeper grade. The use of existing grades is done simply to save cost during the completion of I-69. There is nothing about the physical nature of these roadway sections worthy of exception from the new roadbed standard of 4%.

One consequence of the 5% grade is the need to add a truck lane to accommodate the slower moving traffic. While this lane already exists in the 5% locations in Monroe County, the adjoining frontage roads do not. The result is that in these uphill cuts additional material must be removed to accommodate the frontage road next to the truck lane for a total ROW width of approximately 238 ft., unless the grassy median is reduced from 60 ft. to 20 ft. of pavement with a concrete barrier strip. That will have the effect of 13 traffic lanes rising out of the BeanBlossom bottoms toward Martinsville- a very rural interstate concept indeed.

This extensive ribbon of concrete will transform Bloomington and Monroe County from the Gateway to Southern Indiana to the Gateway to Central Indiana. This may be a perspective shift welcomed by a few but it is generally an unwanted change for many, many more.

Response:

Appendix EE provides the supporting documentation for the use of 5% grades in some locations along I-69. The analysis documented in this appendix determined that retaining the existing 5% grades would result in an additional speed reduction for trucks of only 1 to 3 mph. It also would avoid over 7,800 (almost 1.5 miles) of road



reconstruction, and save over \$11 million in construction costs. The benefit-cost analysis for retaining the 4% grade, as documented in Appendix E of Appendix EE, shows that discounted benefits of retaining the existing 5% slope are more than 40 times greater than the discounted costs (p. E-3) attributable to a slight increase in the number of forecasted crashes. Six (6) additional crashes over a 20 year span may be anticipated (p. E-2).

The calculation of costs and benefits in Appendix E of Appendix EE follow standard analysis procedures outlined in the Indiana Design Manual. These provide for a comparison of project costs with user benefits. In this case, the user benefits used are changes in forecasted number of crashes.

Truck climbing lanes are not considered on local access roads. Truck climbing lanes are necessary on mainline in these areas regardless of whether the grade is 4% or 5%. The controlling criteria for inclusion of a truck climbing lane is based on the length of the grade and the reduction in truck speed.

PI110-13

Comment:

10.) Sample Road --

While it is appropriate to place an intersection at Sample Road, it is necessary to analyze the usability of the east-west roadway to serve as a collector over the plan horizon and the cost of providing adequate collector capacity going forward. A partial interchange at North Walnut Street will place addition burden on Sample Road both east and particularly west (Please see comments about improvement to Bottom Road under item 7 above.). The urban diamond form on the east side does conserve real estate but may not be suitable in the long-term as the location of the northern-most interchange in Monroe County. Development along the corridor and adjacent lands will continue and become more intense as the Mitchel Plain becomes saturated with development. The resulting demand at Sample Road is unlikely over the 20 year plan horizon but is unavoidable over the long-term. The land between the Interstate ramps and the frontage roads should be purchased now for future use.

Response:

Please refer to PI110-01 response regarding I-69 planning horizon and coordination with Monroe County in regards to local roads. . Final determinations about access, including which properties are acquired, will take place as part of the final design process. Access control between interstate ramps and frontage roads are part of that process.

PI110-14

Comment:

11.) Chambers Pike area --

For every alternative scenario, residents of western Washington Township and eastern Bean-Blossom Township are going to experience significant changes to travel patterns and longer travel times because access to SR 37 is now several more miles away. An



additional complication will be caused by periodic flooding in the Bean-Blossom valley that makes some preferred routes impassable.

Response:

Estimated changes in travel patterns are identified in Section 5.3.4, *Travel Patterns and Accessibility*. Drainage plans for I-69 Section 5 will be coordinated with Monroe and Morgan counties in final design.

PI110-15 Comment:

12.) Liberty Church --

Some portions of this interchange are in the floodplain and moving the interchange north would avoid the floodplain and reduce disruption to existing homes and businesses.

Response:

In the Refined Preferred Alternative, the Liberty Church diamond interchange has been shifted north to minimize impacts to floodplains located in the southwest and southeast corners of the interchange.

PI110-16 Comment:

C.) Other questions:

1.) ROW recovery --

What happens to existing INDOT ROW that is not utilized for I-69, particularly at the 2nd Street interchange? Is it retained as INDOT property, turned over to City or County government, or sold to private parties?

Response:

Decisions about the potential to declare portions of existing INDOT property as "Excess Land" will be made during the final design phase on a case-by-case basis. This decision will take into account both the need for right-of-way as determined in final design, as well as possible needs for future modification of interchange features, such as ramps.



PI110-17 **Comment:**

2.) ADT values --

In Table 3-13 the meaning of the entries with two values is not explained. For example the entry for Fullerton Pike Alternative 8 is 14,000 / 10,500 and for Alternative 7 is 13,600 / 10,700. What is signified by each number, why are they different, and why are the pairs different? It seems that different data is being used for each alternative but no explanation is given as to why or what is different. The interchange configuration is identical.

Response:

An explanation has been added to Chapter 3, *Alternatives*, prior to Table 3-13, where the ADT values are given. The traffic volumes shown in Table 3-13 in the Cross Traffic ADT rows are the expected 2035 average daily traffic (ADT) volumes on the cross streets listed in the row immediately above. The first value represents the ADT volume (total both directions) on the cross street immediately east of all ramps while the second number is the ADT volume west of all ramps. The Ramp ADT rows provide the total ramp ADT volumes for all ramps in the given interchange. The traffic forecasts are generated by a corridor wide travel demand model. A separate model run is generated for each alternative. Traffic volumes will vary at a specific cross street or interchange location based on the access provided to I-69, as well as connections and number of lanes providing connectivity throughout the roadway network. Changes to the roadway network between alternatives, including differences in access at other interchanges, will of necessity generate different forecast volumes at interchanges. In Section 5, differences in access locations or the amount of connections will affect traffic volumes more than the actual interchange configurations.

PI111 **1/2/2013 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Jerry E. McDaniel

PI111-01 **Comment:**

Alternative 8 proposes to displace all residents of this area. There are about 60 acres in Morgan County with 5 residences; 4 homes, 1 trailer and 3 barns on Cooksey Lane. In Monroe County 1 trailer and approximately 65 acres; most of the acreage is farm land. This proposal will cause this land to not have an exit or entrance.

We believe that a road that would run parallel to SR 37 from Cooksey Lane to Pine Boulevard would be less expensive than buying all the land, property and timber.

Response:

Please refer to PI085-01 response.



PI112 **12/28/2012 E-mail (I-69, Section 4)**
Dennis Perez

PI112-01 **Comment:**

To whom it may concern, I am concerned about the impact that using Fullerton Pike as the Bloomington southern interchange will have on the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Furthermore, the increase in traffic in across the entrance to Batchelor Middle School will create a dangerous situation for the many walkers heading to school from the Eagleview and Clear Creek neighborhoods. It would seem that Old 37 or Tapp Road would be better choices as the residential impact is less in both of those cases.

Response:

Please refer to PI046-03 and PI110-04 responses.

PI113 **1/2/2013 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Michael B. Bigler

PI113-01 **Comment:**

Alternative 8 proposes to displace all residents of this area. There are about 60 acres in Morgan County with 5 residences; 4 homes, 1 trailer and 3 barns on Cooksey Lane. In Monroe County 1 trailer and approximately 65 acres; most of the acreage is farm land. This proposal will cause this land to not have an exit or entrance.

We believe that a road that would run parallel to SR 37 from Cooksey Lane to Pine Boulevard would be less expensive than buying all the land, property and timber.

Response:

Please refer to PI085-01 response.

PI114 **1/2/2013 Comment Form (Mailed)**
Larry & Hilde McConaughy

PI114-01 **Comment:**

1) The current right-of-way for the state opposite my property is at the fence line parallel to the highway. When the current 4 lane was constructed in 1970, a "temporary" right of way was granted to the state to facilitate construction of a new entry road into my property. There was no transfer of property to the state at that time or later.

Response:

Comment noted. The EIS process approximates potential property impacts using available GIS data. In the Refined Preferred Alternative, potential property impacts may



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

occur along the western edge of your parcel of land alongside existing SR 37 right of way. Any acquisition of land would occur in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-646). Displacements and right-of-way purchases will be finalized in design. At that time, a more thorough review of each property is conducted prior to acquisition. You may reach us in the Section 5 Project Office at 3802 Industrial Blvd., Unit 2, Bloomington, IN 47403 (812-355-1390) for more detailed discussion about your property.

PI114-02 Comment:

2) The projected 2 lane access road in front of Hoosier Energy lies close to the north bound lane of I-69 but veers to the east along the McConnaughy property. If this section could adhere to the road as close as the section fronting the Hoosier Energy land, it would require less appropriated right of way along the McConnaughy property, saving the pond and keeping traffic further from the McConnaughy residence. If the Spruce trees which were planted 40 years ago to alleviate the traffic noise can be replaced, this would be a positive approach.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-02 response. With the Refined Preferred Alternative, the east side access road in this area now begins at the north end of the McConnaughy property.

PI115 1/2/2013 Comment Form (Mailed)
Carrie Vannieuwenhze, Lab Coordinator, Metaugus

PI115-01 Comment:

I would like to suggest that you add another alternative for your planned expansion on I-69 section 5. Our business would greatly benefit from an access road going south from the SR 46 traffic light (which allows motorists to turn left onto SR 37) and merge with Industrial Park Dr. There is nothing on that stretch of land that would preclude the process and would allow greater entry into the various the businesses located on Industrial Park Dr. I work as a lab coordinator for Metaugus NPRI and we are extremely concerned about the response times of our emergency personnel should an accident happen. We house chemicals on site here that our researchers use that can become volatile even hazardous. In preparing our companies chemical hygiene plan and making sure we are compliant with OSHA regulations it is imperative that emergency fire and safety and HAZMAT personnel have easy entry in the event of some major accident. We are keenly aware of this and have to be!! It would also propose that the Whitehall Crossing Blvd. open to allow both an entry and exit point to this location. Both of these options would be more cost effective and provide a reasonable amount a security and align with our safety concerns. There is a gas company as well as a school located in this group of businesses so safety concerns for the children and employees that work in this park should be foremost in the thoughts of the developers. Access is crucial! Response time imperative. We want to promote Bloomington as a place to do business. As our laboratory/company grows we need an easier entrance into this facility. We want to encourage growth and expansion. I did not see any plans for this particular area where



we reside that would allow that to happen. I think it will cause many to lose potential clients because they will need to travel out of their way to get here with the current proposals in place.

Please consider the options presented as our primary concern here at Metaugus is the safety of our employees, surrounding businesses and residents.

Response:

Please refer to PI099-01 response.

PI116 **1/2/2013 Comment Form (Mailed)**
Mobie L. McCammon

PI116-01 **Comment:**

1. Let me begin by saying that I have been opposed to the project. I think we ought to fix the roads that we have. I also considered it to be a waste of “taxpayer’s money”. However, it is here and I hope it will be finished in a proper fashion -- not in a [illegible] up fashion because of lack of funds.
2. I am a willing seller because of the proximity of the construction, moving utilities and the noise level during construction and after. We do not want to be here.

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to PI005-01 response.

PI116-02 **Comment:**

3. I cannot agree with the decision to bypass Wapehani Bike Park & Trail. I have lived here for 10 years and I have never seen a bike over there. It has been explained to all, but I do not agree. How can you justify spending an additional 5.4 million dollars of “taxpayer money” for a lake and bike trail?

Response:

Please refer to PI011-01 response.

PI116-03 **Comment:**

4. I would like I-69 to become a toll road. Let the people who use it pay for the upkeep of the road. Some people will never use the road, yet our tax money will be used to maintain the road -- not fair.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-23 response.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

PI116-04 **Comment:**

5. I would like to compliment the staff who conducted the public hearing and who works in the I-69 office for their professionalism and helpful guidance.

Response:

Comment noted.

PI117 **1/2/2013 Comment Form (Mailed)**
Jay Connaughton, Metaugus NPRI

PI117-01 **Comment:**

Metaugus which is located in Cedartown, Georgia started in 1988 and is an FDA registered custom product development and contract manufacturing company. In September of this year I launched Metaugus Natural Products Research Institute located on 2116 W Industrial Park Dr. in Bloomington. IN. This division of Metaugus focuses on nutritional chemistry and provides research, clinical trials and development for the chemical, nutritional and flavor and fragrance industries. I've assembled a small team that includes three PhD chemists, one research chemist with 20 years in the industry, a lab coordinator and an I.U. professor who consults for us. Our researchers work with chemicals daily, some of which are hazardous. Due to our research, safety is paramount to our facility as we maintain OSHA compliant standards within our building. Of chief concern is the recent news I received regarding the proposed plans for the expansion of I-69, primarily section 5. (The corridor between Martinsville and Bloomington). Our lab coordinator attended a meeting in which 8 alternatives were distributed for the area on which my facility resides. As we see it there needs to be more alternatives for the safety and well-being of not only our employees but the surrounding businesses as well. I propose that you offer and access road. The access road would start from SR 46 at the traffic light that allows motorists to turn left or south onto what is now SR 37. If you had an access/frontage road that ran alongside SR 37 it could then merge with Industrial Park Dr. There is nothing historical, residential or protected in that small stretch of land there. There needs to be access for first responders should an accident or emergency occur, the current proposals do not appear to address this. Additionally, I would propose opening Whitehall Crossing Blvd. which is currently closed as this would provide another access/exit point north to Industrial Park Dr.

Response:

Please refer to PI099-01 response.

PI117-02 **Comment:**

As Metaugus NPRI grows we foresee the need to have even greater access to our facility as vendors and clients come in, which none of the current plans address. Currently the alternatives in place do not address any businesses that reside on Industrial Park Dr. and

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

their ability to expand. Growth is a good thing for the city of Bloomington and not providing the necessary access/exit points to these businesses will stifle growth for this area. As President of Metaugus my chief concern is the safety of our employees and the surrounding businesses. As we see the issues at hand the response time will only increase for first responders and we all know how critical those first few minutes are in any type of emergency. Please review my suggestions as I believe it is the best solution for all concerned not only from a retail and growth perspective but for the safety and well-being of all concerned.

Response:

Please refer to PI099-01 response.

**PI118 1/2/2013 Comment Form (Mailed)
No Name Provided, Northside Christian Church****PI118-01 Comment:**

Northside is a growing church with a congregation of 300+. We average 5-10 visitors per Sunday. Most of the congregation accesses the church from Acuff Road and 100% from Prow Rd. With Acuff Road slated to close the attendance at Northside will suffer causing a decrease in offerings and the ability of the church to function.

Response:

Please refer to PI118-02 response regarding the closure of Acuff Road. While local access modifications would occur as a result of I-69 development, the purpose of I-69, as defined in the Tier 1 FEIS, is to provide improved transportation linkages between Evansville and Indianapolis. The project will improve regional travel and accessibility for Southwest Indiana residents and businesses. This regional improvement in transportation accessibility could allow easier access for potential congregation from a wider area to attend church services.

PI118-02 Comment:

In addition several businesses will be affected by the closing of Acuff. 1) Meadows Hospital, 2) Cook Medical Supply, 3) Bloomington North High School with all related activities, 4) Northside Christian Church, 5) Life Church, 6) Calvary Baptist Church, 7) Shepard Wesley Church, 8) limestone quarry, 9) State Highway garage, 10) Several homes and condominiums, 11) Parking areas for IU overflow parking. Acuff and Prow Roads are always busy with school buses, delivery trucks and personal vehicles. With Acuff closed getting to any of these businesses will take additional time & effort. This will show itself in longer response times for emergency ambulances, fire trucks, State Police, Bloomington Police, Monroe County Police and State Highway trucks. Alternate ways to get to these necessary businesses are narrow two lane, curvy & hilly roads (Arlington Rd., Kinser Pike, Acuff Road). All of the additional traffic on these roads will result in accidents & mortality.



Response:

Section 5.2.3.2, *Commercial and Institutional Displacements*, identifies impacts to churches and businesses; Section 5.3.4, *Travel Patterns and Accessibility*, addresses travel time impacts; and Section 5.6.3.1, *Traffic Conditions*, provides information related to traffic volumes associated with Acuff Road. The Refined Preferred Alternative closes Acuff Road at SR 37. Acuff Road in this location is a low volume local road. Access to I-69 on the east would be provided along Acuff Road to Kinser Pike to Bayles Road to SR 37 Business to the Walnut interchange. Access to I-69 would be provided along Acuff Road to Maple Grove Road to Arlington Road to Hunter Lane to Hunter Valley Road to the existing SR 46 interchange.

PI118-03

Comment:

The financial impact on Northside will be huge if access to Acuff from 37/69 is closed. Not only will a decrease in attendance cause a financial hardship for Northside but property value will also decrease making it impossible to relocate.

A recent survey of the congregation at Northside proved that a majority of attendees are concerned with the extra hardship of getting to church.

We are asking that you reconsider making Acuff Road directly accessible to 37/69.

Response:

The survey referenced in this comment was not provided to project staff. You may contact the Section 5 Project Office at 3802 Industrial Blvd., Unit 2, Bloomington, IN 47403 (812-355-1390) for a more detailed discussion about your property.

PI119

**1/2/2013 Comment Form (Mailed)
David & Cheryl Lehman**

PI119-01

Comment:

1) We will be denied the full enjoyment of our property that we have owned for 15 years, because of the noise pollution caused by the upgrade to I-69 that will increase traffic up to 4 times what we have now during all hours of the day. Our trees help now for 5 months of the year but, a sound barrier should be built so we people that own property adjacent to the road and homes less than 100 yards away can enjoy our environment without the constant roar from trucks and cars next door at all hours of the day.

Response:

Please refer to PI049-01 response regarding basis for determining whether noise barriers may be provided. The analysis at this location determined that a noise barrier is not feasible, since this location would neither have a 15 decibel (dBA) increase over existing sound levels nor approach or exceed the noise abatement criteria for residential



areas (67 dBA is used for residential areas). A noise impact occurs if the noise level reaches the 66 dBA threshold (within 1 dBA of the noise abatement criteria). For this reason, a noise barrier was not considered at this location.

PI119-02 Comment:

- 2) With the blocking of so many entrances to the future I-69 the extra traffic will be pushed onto small local roads that were never expected to carry the volume. Prow Rd. north of us is very narrow and a safety hazard already. Also the access north of the Ind. 46 bypass that will have to be utilized by 1000's of people has no deceleration lane to get off 46 onto Monroe St. & Grimes lane, which is dangerous now and will become much more dangerous with the huge increase in traffic volume forced there by I-69.

Response:

Please refer to LG007-08 response.

PI119-03 Comment:

- 3) North Walnut access to I-69 should be a full interchange to allow access from and to all directions, anything less would be substandard and limit access.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-46 response.

PI119-04 Comment:

- 4) Vernal Pike and Kinser Pike should both be full interchanges to allow better access to and from I-69. Vernal Pike is an especially busy intersection that backs traffic up 20-30 cars at a time, at various hours of the day.

Response:

As explained in Section S.6.4.3, *Interchange Options for Alternatives*, a Vernal Pike interchange would exceed the FHWA minimum interstate interchange spacing guidelines relative to the SR 46 interchange. An interchange was considered at Kinser Pike under Alternative 4.

PI119-05 Comment:

- 5) We also believe that I-69 should not be a "toll road" of any sort. It should be paid for with current and future State and Federal funds and not built substandard requiring extensive funds to repair and maintain in the future both near and further down the line. A toll road would make the disruption of I-69 much worse for the thousands of citizens that live up and down this corridor.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Any questions? Let us know. Thank you.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-23 response.

PI120

12/12/2012 Letter (Mailed)

Bruce Storm, Bruce Storm Real Estate & Management Company

PI120-01

Comment:

I have written a letter to the editor of the H.T. and it's been published. I spoke at the public meeting at the Monroe County Fairgrounds.

But my suggestion seems to fall on deaf ears. I have enclosed a rough diagram of an improvement idea that I believe warrants consideration.

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for copy of annotated drawings.]

This Vernal Pike and 37 (new 69) is such a very heavily used access and thorough fare from inner city traffic trying to get to the west side and to avoid Third Street, which is already bumper to bumper traffic.

Your proposed underpass gets the traffic through going east and west – which will help - BUT the number of inner city people using this intersection to get to the Westside Shopping Center and to get access to go north on 37 (69) is a very large number of people. Please just give us access ramp to go north from Vernal Pike and please, please give us an access ramp to go south to alleviate congestion on 3rd St. & 37.

I know that budget is always a consideration. However, I'm not suggesting a full blown intersection. Please consider just two access ramps. There would be no egress from 69 to Vernal Pike but just having egress ramps would alleviate much congestion and be a very positive contribution for the traffic flow.

Response:

Please refer to PI119-04 and PI099-01 responses.

PI121

1/2/2013 E-mail (I-69)

Ann Elsner

PI121-01

Comment:

The recent death of a pedestrian crossing Rhorer Road to get his mail emphasizes why the Gordon Pike/Rhorer Road needs to be rethought. Those of us who live in the established neighborhoods through which a major arterial is planned are concerned about the safety of school children who must cross this road to reach Batchelor Middle School and Jackson Creek Middle School.

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

We are also concerned about the noise and pollution in an otherwise quiet, hillside village atmosphere.

Response:

This comment does not cite the location of this pedestrian accident; however, the roads cited are outside of the Section 5 project. Please see PI046-03 regarding the separate Monroe County project on Fullerton Pike which may also affect the area cited.

PI121-02**Comment:**

There is a reason that most cities with similar elevation changes choose to build roads around this terrain, even in regions with less precipitation. An alternative is to make a fly-over ramp, with a frontage road connecting to That Road and Second Street, where there is sufficient right of way to bring in cars, and existing roadways because the terrain permits this I must also add, as an employee of IU, I inquired about the university status of this road, and they are neutral. Thus, claims at the first public meeting that IU was a driving force behind this road were not accurate at that time. There has been no communication that IU has generated an interest in having a road so far south. This is unrelated to their hospital plans, at least at the time of these meetings, since their plans are farther north.

Response:

The request involves foregoing an interchange at Fullerton Pike, providing access instead at Tapp Rd. and 2nd St. As documented in FEIS Section S.6.4.3, Tapp Rd. is too close to the SR 37 interchange to also serve as an access point.

PI122**1/2/2013 Comment Form (Project Office)****Mike Kiser, Owner, Chapman Lake Instrument****PI122-01****Comment:**

The proposed changes at the intersection of Vernal Pike and 37/69 are going to have a very bad effect on those of us who do business on Industrial Drive. Property and business values will fall significantly because of the isolation these changes will cause.

At a recent meeting, two fellow business owners made suggestions that would reduce this isolation considerably. One idea was to construct a short frontage road between Industrial Drive and Whitehall Crossing Blvd. This could be done by adding two lanes to the new bridge over the CSX Railroad. Another idea was to provide an exit from southbound 37/69 just east of the State Police Post that would either go under Vernal Pike to Industrial Drive, or would turn westward to end at the intersection of Vernal Pike & Industrial. The simplest solution would be a grade RR crossing from the Industrial Drive cul-de-sac to the streets that exist on the other side of the tracks. But apparently the RR won't permit that. Please do something! We don't want to be isolated!

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for copy of map.]



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Response:

Please refer to PI099-01 response.

PI123 **1/3/2013 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Richard A. Bales

PI123-01 **Comment:**

Subject: Cooksey Lane

Alternative 8 proposes displacement of all residents of this area. We, the property owners, wish to propose our idea, as shown on the attached sketch.

Proposal:

Build a service road to run parallel to 37/69 from Cooksey Lane to Pine Boulevard, approx. one mile. This would eliminate the displacement of 11 families and minimize travel time to Godsey Road Exchange.

[Referenced sketch is included with Charles Wm. Cooksey Comment PI091 as he is the one who provided it.]

Response:

Please refer to PI085-01 response.

PI124 **12/31/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Michael B. Dyer, ECS Inc.

PI124-01 **Comment:**

17th & Vernal Pike Intersection.

You can make 17th Street over I-69 or underpass with ingress/degress lanes on each side. An access road can go from 17th Street south going over the CSX railroad and connect to the Whitehall Crossing Blvd which is closing. This will help traffic going into Lowes, Cracker Barrel & others by not using the 3rd Street exit. * I think it would be very important for the State Police Post to have access to 69 in both directions. This would give business in Industrial Park access both ways as well as help overall traffic flow. Not bottlenecking up the 3rd Street exit. OPTION #2 would give access to 69 S from 17th Street if access at the Whitehall Crossing exit is too close to 3rd Street exit. But still continue the access road one way to go to Lowes or Cracker Barrel.

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for copy of map included with comment.]



Response:

Please refer to PI099-01 response.

PI125 **1/3/2013 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Larry R. Eads

PI125-01 **Comment:**

Here are suggestions which seem more compatible:

Option #1 – Close Kinser Pike on the south end - use the money saved on building the overpass and land acquisition on the Kinser - Pike-Bottom Road exchange.

Option #2 – Move the new ROW to the north on my property towards 4919 N. Kinser Pike. No one has lived in that house for about three years. My deed shows that I own some of the property on the other side of the road.

I would like to talk to someone about this. I need more information on this so I can go forward.

[Please refer to comment in FEIS Volume III Part B for copy of map and survey of property.]

Response:

In regards to Option #1, closing of Kinser Pike has been evaluated in the EIS as part of Alternative 6 (see Table S-1, *Summary of Section 5 Alternatives by Major Feature for Alternatives 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and Refined Preferred Alternative 8* and also Section 5.3.4, *Travel Patterns and Accessibility*). In regards to Option #2, the EIS process approximates potential property impacts using available GIS data. The referenced property is identified as a potential displacement for the Refined Preferred Alternative. However, please note that the final determinations about access, including which properties are acquired, will take place as part of the final design process. At that time, more detailed design and a more thorough review of each property is conducted prior to acquisition. You may reach us in the Section 5 Project Office at 3802 Industrial Blvd., Unit 2, Bloomington, IN 47403 (812-355-1390) for more detailed discussion about your property.

PI126 **1/1/2013 Comment Form (Mailed)**
Donna Lentz Ferree

PI126-01 **Comment:**

I thought the purpose of eminent domain was to allow-necessary for public good-taking of land. This started out with 2-3 business people in Washington, IN- because they saw the need for a SW highway-through their area. Because they couldn't get support for a highway (which I am not arguing was needed) they attached the idea to the Federal



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Interstate System to achieve their goals. They worked extensively through the Chamber of Commerce to persuade others of possible economic gains.

Monroe County was pushed to agree with an interstate-when “IT REALLY SERVES NO PURPOSE” for the larger community. It was pushed through the Chamber of Commerce, political, media power and the Herald Times wanted it. It was never what the larger community wanted-only a circle of people. Who wanted what they wanted for their personal gain and accolades.

For many people-too many people-have lost their homes and heritage property and the landscape is rugged-with some of highest ridges in Monroe County being plowed through-that the rural setting and lifestyle of hundreds of people are being affected by something a few people with power wanted. The landscape will be dramatically altered forever. And it's a shame! Plus deer population is great at every country road crossing of I-69 (herds of 15-20 each road every night).

I thought the purpose of the interstates is to move traffic-especially cargo trucks the quickest most efficient route from point A to point B. And to avoid going through established communities as much as possible. This interstate is ripping through the heart of our country.

With the push for smaller vehicles-especially in Bloomington-I see a great conflict with merging local traffic with cross country truckers. We depend on 37 for daily travel.

Evansville to Crane was on flat farm land with the ability to keep straight smooth movement of vehicles. Taking this interstate in many curves and through rougher terrain only to consume IN 37-makes NO SENSE. Especially considering the impact on so many people's private lives and compromising local traffic safety.

This interstate needs to travel north to I-70 (no matter what Lugar says) and absorb into an east/west trucking route-before pouring into 465. (And will put n/s I-69 travelers closer to Indianapolis airport) 465 is a nightmare as it is-how in the world could any more-especially trucking traffic be added? Stop now and reconsider bigger picture here. Please.

Doesn't Evansville really want to get to Indy more than Bloomington anyway?

Note: I can attest to great number of deer at Breeden, Burch, Harmony and Rockport. (I'm a night time traveler and know firsthand about our population of deer in south west Monroe County.

Response:

This is a generally-worded comment which raises many issues related to the selection of a route in the Tier 1 study. It makes suggestions (such as not upgrading SR 37), without citing specific alternatives. The transportation goals cited (e.g., safety and freight movement) were considered in Tier 1 in arriving at a selected alternative. Overall, it



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

raises 1 issues which were addressed in the Tier 1 study, and do not need to be readdressed in this Tier 2 study.

Other issues cited (wildlife crossings in Section 4) were addressed in the Section 4 FEIS. See Section 5.18.4, *Wildlife Considerations, Mitigation*. This section identifies 37 potential wildlife crossing locations. 11 of these are at stream crossings and 6 of these are at underpasses which will be sized to allow the passage of large mammals (such as deer) under I-69.

PI127 **12/31/2012 Comment Form (Mailed)**
Roberta Mann

PI127-01 **Comment:**

I hope the holidays have treated you well! Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Section 5 I-69 project. The purpose of this letter is to provide some information on my property prior to the start of the project.

My property, at the address above [9145 N. Mann Rd], provides a watershed for the existing State Road 37. A large ravine on my property is bisected by a pond dam which also serves as my driveway. There is a state owned drainage pipe that feeds the pond on one side, and another that feeds a small stream on the other side of the dam.

The south side of my drive with a large ravine and stream was once a pond as well. However, sedimentation from the highway drain continually filled the pond, eventually leading to a collapse of the dam many years ago. The north side of my drive is what is probably now considered a marsh or some other form of wetland. However, this too was once a vibrant pond providing a home to ducks and geese in the spring. It also was filled with sediment from a drainage pipe from Highway 37.

The drainage pipes that feed these two areas have long been eroding and washing out. The sediment, trash, and other debris from the highway eventually make it to the pond or the ravine. This has caused quite a bit of damage to the watershed and quite a bit of additional work for me.

I am not an engineer but I understand that INDOT will follow a written Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) during construction. If I understand this correctly, this plan should address any soil erosion onto my property during construction.

My concern at this time is the ongoing sedimentation and drainage that the new Interstate will pose after construction is over. As I mentioned, there is a ravine between my home and the highway bisected by my driveway. The additional volume of water, sediment, and trash from the highway has the potential to harm my property and its value.

Before plans are finalized for the area, I would very much like to discuss these issues with personnel who will be engineering the drainage plans. It is my hope that we can review the current drainage situation and develop a plan that will serve the needs of the



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

new Interstate, frontage roads, and exits, along with addressing the proper use and care of the wetlands on my property.

Thank you again for this opportunity to voice my concerns and provide comments.

Response:

Further coordination specific to controlling additional runoff from I-69 will occur during final design. As noted, the SWPPP will address construction and post-construction erosion control measures. Drainage plans will be developed as part of final design. This comment has also been forwarded to the INDOT Seymour District for consideration of the existing concerns associated with SR-37.

PI128 **11/28/2012 Letter, Project Office
Craig Smith, The Idle Zone, Inc.**

PI128-01 **Comment:**

This is a follow-up letter for the consideration of an early buy out under the Hardship Acquisition Policy. From our letter dated October 21, 2009. We are in financial trouble. The economy is getting a little better, but it is very hard to make it with paying double taxes. We have talked to a couple more realtors and they all say the same thing. It will not sale because of I-69. Talking to property owners all around us have been contacted by investment company's. But we have not had one call because it is going right over us.

Our request was denied in 2009 because of not sure were the route was going. Now the preferred route is alt. #8 and it does take us out. Also the city and county wants it here. In saying this we would like to talk to you A.S.A.P. Because we are in a time sensitive spot. We are in our slow period (winter). Things are not time sensitive now. But late spring or early summer would kill our business if we were to move. We hope to stay in business if we can financially. If we do move there are thing that have to happen fast for us. We have to find a place or build to suit us but also we have to contact our distributors. To make sure we can sell their products. In our field (marine) we have territory's. So we would like start this A.S.A.P. So if or when we move it will not be in peak season.

We would like to start looking in December, but it is hard to if we don't know the amount we are getting. We don't want to start calling our distributors. But we are afraid they might start looking for other dealers in our territory. Also we don't want them to think we may not reopen.

We would appreciate a quick response to this letter. Because time is important for the survival of The Idle Zone Inc.

Response:

This request is under review by INDOT. An early kitchen table meeting with The Idle Zone was held on July 1, 2013.



(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)



Public Comments – Organizations

PO001 **12/6/2012 Comment Form - Public Hearing**
Suzanne Mittenthal, Knobstone Hiking Trail Association

PO001-01 **Comment:**

This highway was never economically nor environmentally justified.

Response:

Comment noted.

PO002 **12/17/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)**
David Devitt, Board Member, Crescent Bend Neighborhood Association

PO002-01 **Comment:**

Bethany Stevens of Indiana Recycling Resource, LLC is trying to obtain a permit for a Solid Waste Transfer Station inside the Bloomington city limits at the current J.B. Salvage site on Vernal Pike. I want the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) and the I-69 planners to visualize the future infrastructure problems that will happen if the state issues a permit for this project. When I-69 comes through Bloomington, the large trash trucks and semis will no longer have a direct access to Vernal Pike from Highway 37 /I-69.

Response:

Thank you for raising awareness of this concern. IDEM is aware of I-69 plans for 17th Street / Vernal Pike. INDOT and the City of Bloomington are coordinating on this issue and many others relating to the I-69 project and local infrastructure. IDEM is responsible for the permitting of this transfer station; the City of Bloomington is responsible for compliance with zoning ordinances. As a result of this request, IDEM has included a copy of Mr. Devitt's I-69 comment letter in their records for consideration as they review the noted permit application. In regards to I-69, all Section 5 alternatives have provided for the closure of Vernal Pike; these alternatives have been publicly discussed since 2007. (See May, 2007 Section 5 *Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report*, available on the I-69 Project website at http://www.i69indyevn.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/Report_PreAltAnalysis.pdf.) Also, INDOT has coordinated on the Section 5 project with IDEM since the beginning of Tier 2 studies in 2004 through regularly-held interagency meetings which are documented in Appendix C. This included an interagency review meeting of this *Screening Report* which provided plans to close access at Vernal Pike for all alternatives. IDEM participated in this July 3, 2007 meeting; the meeting summary is provided in Appendix C. It also provided comments on the DEIS. Please refer to PO002-05 response for further information regarding 17th Street / Vernal Pike access and I-69.



PO002-02 Comment:

I am attaching the letter addressed to the Bloomington City Council representatives from the Crescent Bend Neighborhood Association to become part of the public record. I am requesting that the I-69 planners notify IDEM about these concerns. The lack of communication between these two agencies was previously observed when Section 42 gave millions of dollars to the Crescent Pointe development. The city gave its approval knowing the Crescent Pointe houses being built bordering 17th St. would be adversely affected by the I-69 overpass/underpass. I want these two state agencies to be aware of the future impact on the Crescent Bend Neighborhood.

Response: 3

Please refer to PO002-01 response. Additionally, the City of Bloomington has been an active participant in the EIS process as a participating agency, and as part of the Expert Land Use Panel meetings for I-69 (see FEIS Appendix E, *Expert Land Use Panel Meeting Notes*).

PO002-03 Comment:

- Where will the 100 tons of daily trash be directed to enter and exit the proposed Solid Waste Transfer Station on Vernal Pike?
- Who is overseeing and ensuring that the Crescent Bend infrastructure will be safe once Vernal Pike is closed at Highway 37 /I-69?

Response:

Improvements to the intersection of Crescent Road and 17th Street are included in the I-69 Refined Preferred Alternative. The City of Bloomington is responsible for local infrastructure beyond the limits of the I-69 project. Increased traffic on Crescent Road is recognized in the FEIS analysis. Please refer to PO002-01 and PO002-05 responses.

PO002-04 Comment:

Attachment: Letter dated December 3, 2012 to Bloomington City Council Representatives from Crescent Bend Neighborhood Association Executive Committee Members

The Crescent Bend Neighborhood received a letter from Bethany Stevens of Indiana Recycling Resource, LLC. The letter states: ((As required by IC 13-15-8 and 329 IAC 10-12-1 (a)- (b), please be advised the agent for the property Owner, has made application to IDEM, on November 7, 2012, for a Solid Waste Facility, Transfer Station permit. The project is known as Indiana Recycling Resource, LLC, DBA Vernal Pike Transfer and Recycling, In Bloomington, Indiana. A copy of this application, legal description and all development plans pertaining to this proposed development plan are on file and available for examination at the Monroe County Public Library, 303 E. Kirkwood Avenue, IN 47404."



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Upon examination of these IDEM documents, it appears that this transfer station will be located on Vernal Pike on the property of JB Salvage. Our concerns are:

1. There will not be a public hearing regarding this project as stated by Planning and Engineering.
2. Although there is an existing salvage company at this location, a solid waste transfer station, being significantly different, would perhaps be in violation of the current zoning ordinance.
3. Who will be responsible for removing road trash that blows from uncovered vehicles transporting solid waste to and from the transfer station?
4. Why would the City think that it's appropriate, and go so far as to send a letter of recommendation to IDEM, to send large vehicles, hauling trash, through a core neighborhood which includes two existing school zones (Tri-North and Head Start), narrow streets and few sidewalks?

Response:

The questions in this letter are directed to the City of Bloomington. Please also note PO002-01 and PO002-05 responses.

PO002-05

Comment:

It is estimated that 4,200 yards or 100 tons of trash will be moved in and out via large trucks and trailers each day. Therefore this project will undoubtedly require a significant increase in large truck traffic on an infrastructure that at present cannot support multiple trips of this vehicle type. Has there been discussion about infrastructure changes that would immediately be necessary to accommodate this type of traffic? Large trucks will not be able to enter or exit via Adams Street because of the low train trestle/bridge and railroad crossings. Similar problems occur at the Bender bridge on W. 11th Street. It will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for a large semitruck to access Monroe Street. Therefore, if the Vernal Pike/Highway 37 intersection is closed due to the I-69 project, the only way these trucks can exit the transfer station would be on Crescent Road. Even if W. 17th Street is widened/updated, Crescent Road will remain inadequate which will directly affect the health and safety of local residents.

Response:

Improvements proposed in this area as part of the Refined Preferred Alternative will be designed to accommodate truck traffic. Local traffic related issues associated with the Vernal Pike area are the responsibility of the City of Bloomington. INDOT is coordinating with the City of Bloomington as a participating agency for the Section 5 project. See Section 11.3, *Public and Community Outreach*, for additional information about the participating agency process. Traffic related impacts associated with I-69 are addressed in Sections 5.3, *Land Use and Community Impacts*, and Section 5.6, *Traffic Impacts*.



The Refined Preferred Alternative reduces impacts in this area. For example, the overpass at Vernal Pike maintains traffic on the east side of the roadway by avoiding closure of North Crescent Street and reduces maintenance of traffic disruptions during construction. In addition, the overpass at Vernal Pike avoids the potential for groundwater resource issues associated with the Lemon Land Landfill Superfund Site and ILCS, a concern raised by the USEPA. Fewer displacements within Crescent Bend neighborhood are also recognized with this solution versus alternatives that provide a new underpass connecting to 17th Street on the east and Vernal Pike on the west (Alternatives 4, 5, 6). Turning radii for truck routes associated with Vernal Pike/17th Street, Curry Pike, and SR 48 will be designed to accommodate 18 wheel multiple-unit trucks.

PO002-06 Comment:

Please note, there may be potential for the proposed transfer station at this location as long as trucks are able to enter and exit via the existing Vernal Pike and Highway 37 intersection. However, in the near future, we are very concerned that the City cannot guarantee that INDOT will agree to revise the I-69 plan and protect the integrity of the northwest side by keeping an access to the west and Terre Haute through the Vernal Pike intersection. We also understand that this will likely not be an interchange; however an access at Vernal Pike would allow these loaded trucks to exit the transfer station more efficiently and with less negative impact to our schools, residences and businesses.

Response:

Please refer to PO002-05 response.

**PO003 12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)
Christy Gillenwater, Hoosier Voices for I-69 / Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce**

PO003-01 Comment:

Yes, thank you. Thank you. Christy Gillenwater with Hoosier Voices for I-69 and the Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce. First of all, I want to thank this good turnout tonight, individuals for taking their personal time to be here tonight and to our friends at INDOT and fellow contractors here who are also helping with this important project.

Both the Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce and Hoosier Voices for I-69 have supported this project for numerous years, obviously for the economic value we believe it will bring to southern Indiana, the important jobs. Obviously, in these economic times jobs are very imperative, and this section of our state, we believe, will definitely benefit.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

We do know, and we're sensitive to the fact that a number of individuals and businesses are going to be impacted by this interstate, but hope that the greater good for our entire state, for the safety of our travelers, whether it be for business or for pleasure, can also be taken into account. And we have on the Chamber side convened a number of community leaders to discuss the specific details of, in particular, Section 5 as it impacts our community and appreciate those who are coming to the table with thoughtful input on how we can really maximize the opportunities of the interstate and at the same time minimize the changes for community residents, so we're very sensitive to those elements and look forward to our continued partnership with INDOT and the contractors and addressing community needs. This is obviously vitally important as we move forward that our key issues are addressed. So on behalf of both organizations thank you for your cooperation. Thanks.

Response:

Comment noted.

PO004 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Glenn Carter, Citizens Advisory Committee to the MPO

PO004-01 **Comment:**

Hi. My name is Glenn Carter. I sit on the Citizens Advisory Committee to the NPO [MPO]; and my biggest concern is dumping interstate traffic onto an unimproved 37, and I'm afraid that that is nothing less than a cynical attempt to lobby for funding for an unfunded Section 5 by traffic death. Doubling or tripling the traffic and the traffic consisting of heavier trucks and -- and at higher speeds not expecting traffic controls such as stoplights is likely to more than double the number of casualties on that road, which will give INDOT a lobbying strategy to scream bloody murder to the state legislature and the federal government to provide funding for Section 5. I think this entire highway is being done over the objections of a lot of people instead of using existing I-70 to State Road 41 to benefit very few people, and I would urge people to consider the fact that there is still no money identified for Section 5 before we consider anything. The money is simply not there. And so no interchanges can be built, and nothing else can be done without any funding. Thanks.

Response:

Please refer to PO018-16 response. Please also refer to Section 3.3.1.2, *Safety*; crash reductions are one of the goals of the Section 5 project. Total annual crash reductions forecasted in Morgan and Monroe counties show 261 fewer accidents per year with Refined Alternative 8.

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

PO005 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Liz Irwin, Chamber of Commerce

PO005-01 **Comment:**

Thank you very much. I work for the Chamber of Commerce, but I've only recently started working for the Chamber of Commerce; and I've been a supporter of this highway for many years. I came to school here in Indiana for IU from the East Coast, and I have to say that we look at highways very differently out on the East Coast. There is much more congestion; and so when a new highway is built, we see that as a positive thing. I think it's really great to see Indiana looking forward and seeing what the future will bring; and I think this highway is going to be very important for our state, and it's also going to be very important for our community. It's going to increase economic development opportunities, and I think it will improve safety from everything that I've seen in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and other studies.

I think Bloomington needs this highway. As we have seen, Section 1 through 3 is already open for business. Section 4 is on the way, and that will bring increased traffic to our area. I think it's very important that we make sure that Highway 37 is upgraded and is able to handle the traffic that we are being brought by Sections 1 through 4. The highway will add capacity to our own area, and it will make it safer. I think we have an opportunity and an obligation to make this highway the best that we can for this community, and I applaud the efforts that are being taken to make that happen. Thank you.

Response:

Comment noted.

PO006 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Tim Maloney, Hoosier Environmental Council

PO006-01 **Comment:**

Thank you, Mr. Clark. I appreciate the opportunity to speak. My name is Tim Maloney with the Hoosier Environmental Council. And these days we hear a lot of talk about the fiscal cliff and whether our federal government can keep spending money at the pace we do without raising more revenue or cutting our spending. Yet, that is the exact circumstance we find ourselves with I-69. It is our own fiscal cliff as we continue to plan for I-69, but we're not planning for how to pay for it. This is one of the most costly and environmentally damaging public infrastructure projects in the state's history. Yet, we -- we're not doing the proper financial planning to ensure that it goes forward. And, of course, in our view this highway route was a mistake from the beginning. And while we continue, or the State continues making plans to build this highway, it is not making plans to complete it from Bloomington to Martinsville or from Martinsville to Indianapolis. It's not making plans to deal with the continuing controversy along the stretch from Bloomington to Indianapolis or how to overcome the consensus opposition



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

in T[P]erry Township for this highway coming through there. We're not making plans how to deal with the tremendous backlog of road repairs and bridge repairs around Indiana that other speakers have mentioned. We have 4,000 deficient bridges in Indiana, a \$5 billion cost backlog of local road and street repairs; and yet, we continue to plan to build a new interstate that we can't afford. And it's never too late to stop a bad idea; and I think as Mr. Tokarski said, we need to stop what we're doing right now and reevaluate I-69. Thank you.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-23 response in regards to funding. Sections 1 through 3 (of the six Tier 2 sections) have been built and are open to traffic. Section 4 is fully funded, and construction contracts have been awarded for the entire Section 4 project. As such, a "reevaluation" of I-69 would not involve looking at alternative corridors for Sections 1 through 4. Such an analysis of alternative corridors would not provide any relevant information for the Section 5 project.

PO007 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Larry Jacobs, Chamber of Commerce

PO007-01 **Comment:**

Yes, thank you. I'm Larry Jacobs. I'm with the Chamber of Commerce, but I'm an individual that was born and raised here in Bloomington. My entire life, 63 years, I've lived many lives. I'm a retired postmaster in this facility -- or in this Bloomington, Indiana community. I put 38 years and one month into that particular endeavor.

I'm also a volunteer counselor for a small business in Bloomington, and I'm very concerned about business. So I would like to focus my remarks primarily on the economics aspects of I-69. I would say in our community we're very fortunate because we have a major educational institute, that being Indiana University, as well as a superior regional community college in Ivy Tech.

Add to this, we have Quicken, Incorporated, its national headquarters; and, of course, another outstanding regional institution, our own IU Bloomington Health Hospital. And these I identify as being the major core anchors in our community. They provide good jobs for people and good benefits.

Now, growing up in the '50s, '60s, and '70s primarily, I've seen a continual erosion in the realm of manufacturing jobs that once flourished in our community. RCA, Westinghouse, Otis Elevator, Sarcus Tartizan (PHONETIC), they're all gone. General Electric is still operational, but not nearly to the extent that it was years ago. These are jobs that paid well, and they had minimal skill requirements for folks. That aspect has left this community. We no longer have that.

When we ask why south of I-65 from Columbus to Seymour and look at all of the manufacturing facilities that have cropped up in there, one of the former speakers said



you build it, and they will come. And they will. And you just need to go see it. My time is up. Sorry.

Response:

Comment noted.

PO008 **12/6/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)**
Mick Harrison, Citizens for Appropriate Rural Roads

PO008-01 **Comment:**

Thank you. I'm Mick Harrison. I'm an attorney. I represent Citizens for Appropriate Rural Roads who is opposed to I-69. I'm also after several years in an investigation very personally opposed to I-69 for a number of reasons. We don't need it. We can't afford it. It's illegal. INDOT has concealed information from the public that's very important that we need to know, so we now cannot trust INDOT. It's harmful to public health because of increased air pollution. It's harmful to the local environment, particularly the sensitive karst features, endangered species. Given the time restrictions, I can't give you the details of my concerns, but I will be releasing those details over the next couple of weeks in public forums and through press conferences; and I'll send INDOT an invitation so you can hear my detailed comments then.

Response:

Please refer to PO018-01 response.

PO008-02 **Comment:**

The last time I heard someone saying that a major project was coming was a fait accompli and couldn't stop it, I believe, was a PC incinerator. As one of our commenters mentioned, we don't have that incinerator. A number of us opposed it successfully.

I-69 can be stopped, should be stopped, and I intend to do everything I can to stop it. And I don't personally feel unempowered in doing that, and I encourage other folks to assist CARR and me in that mission.

The one thing that I see coming if we do build I-69 is it's going to change the nature of the community. That was one of the reasons we opposed the PC [PCB] incinerator. It's going to bring development we don't need. It's going to cause induced development that's harmful to the environment. It's going to exacerbate a major problem we have in global warming. And really, the only people who will benefit are some real estate folks and folks who are in a position to financially benefit from this including certain contractors for the State.

So I encourage the community to continue to oppose it. Safety, of course, is a legitimate concern, but there are better solutions to improve safety. If we get this



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

highway -- if we look at all aspects of safety, you're going to see a lesser safe community. Thank you.

Response:

Benefits of the project include improving accessibility, reducing congestion, and improving safety, as discussed in FEIS Section 3.3.1, *Transportation Performance Indicators*. Induced development is addressed in Section 5.24, *Indirect and Cumulative Impacts*. Please refer to AF002-28 response regarding climate change.

PO009 **12/20/2012 Letter (Project Office)**
Dewey J. Hardin, Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars
Post 604 - Lauren B. Strain Post

PO009-01 **Comment:**

[Comment form]

Please see attached letter.

[Letter dated 12/20/2012]

First I would like to take a moment to thank your staff in making themselves available for discussion at our facility Wednesday December 19, 2012. This afforded representatives from businesses on West Industrial Park Drive an opportunity to discuss our concerns with respect to the current plans of closing access to/from Vernal Pike in Bloomington as outlined in Alternative 8 (INDOT's Preferred Alternative) Sheet 4 of 14 (undated) to I69 Evansville -to- Indianapolis, Tier 2 Studies, Section 5- SR 37 to SR 39.

This letter is intended to serve as an attachment to the I-69 Section 5 DEIS Official Comment Period form enclosed. Also please find attached sketches of ideas that we hope will influence the planning with respect to access to I-69 from West Industrial Park Drive.

VFW Post 604 was chartered on January 7th 1921 and has served the Bloomington area continuously since this charter. We are extremely concerned about the impact of the current I-69 plans with respect to the loss of access from Vernal Pike to I-69 to our survival as a non-profit Combat Veterans Service organization in Bloomington. Relocating is outside the realm of possibility as our operating capital is small and we cannot realistically expect to survive this loss of access. We recognize using SR 37's footprint is a certainty, but we feel there needs to be greater emphasis placed on reducing the impact on our organization and other businesses not displaced on West Industrial Park Drive. Provided in the attachments are ideas that we hope will be assessed and incorporated in the planning of our area.

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of our community and for taking the time to review our comments.



[The enclosed sketch is located in FEIS Volume III Part B.]

Response:

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the I-69 Section 5 project with members of your organization. Please refer to PI099-01 response in regards to Vernal Pike and West Industrial Drive concerns.

PO010 12/13/2012 E-mail (Project Office) / Letter

Mike Gentile, Board of Directors - Chair, The Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce

PO010-01 Comment:

12/28/2012 Email (Liz Irwin)

Per our conversation this afternoon, attached please find The Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce Comments for I-69 Section 5 DEIS. Please let me know if you have questions or need additional information.

Attached 12/14/2012 letter (Mike Gentile)

Comments for I-69 Section 5 Draft Environmental Impact Statement Approved by Chamber Board of Directors- December 13, 2012

The Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce has been a strong advocate for I-69 for many years and believes it will improve Indiana's economy and spark economic development opportunities along the corridor and throughout the region. We encourage the state to continue to identify funding sources for Section 5, and support building the highway once funds are appropriated. With the recent opening of Sections 1-3 and the expected completion of Section 4 in 2014, our community needs to begin preparing for the increase in traffic that will use the current State Road 37 through Bloomington and into Morgan County. As part of that planning, we have formed a local collaboration group to bring members of the business community, local and state elected officials together to dialogue on the planning and design for Section 5. Subcommittees are looking at specific issues such as the North Walnut Street interchange, bike/pedestrian access, and noise/aesthetics. The local collaboration group has been in contact with INDOT about specific recommendations for planning and design elements and has been reviewing the DEIS.

Based on input from the local collaboration group, The Chamber has identified several areas of importance that it hopes will be considered as this project moves forward.

Response:

Comment noted. Responses to specific comments follow.



PO010-02 Comment:

- Chapter 5.6 of the DEIS discusses traffic impacts. In looking at the "build" versus "no-build" models, it is clear that overall traffic impacts will be much higher with the no-build scenario. By building the highway, we reduce congestion and lower accident rates. The Chamber believes that Section 5 of I-69 is crucial to the safety and wellbeing of our residents in addition to improving economic development opportunities and creating a strong business environment.

Response:

Comment noted. Traffic forecasts have been updated since the DEIS, and are provided in Section 5.6, *Traffic Impacts*. Tables 3-7 to 3-9 in FEIS Section 3.3.1, *Transportation Performance Indicators*, compare the anticipated reductions in crashes and congestion.

PO010-03 Comment:

- We need to identify areas of potential safety concern and address those areas prior to the opening of Section 4 so that the existing State Road 37 is able to handle traffic safely. Several intersections are already known for safety and congestion issues which will only become further exacerbated when Section 4 opens. These include Vernal Pike, Tapp Road and Fullerton Pike. These intersections, along with other safety hazards, should receive top priority for improvement prior to the completion of Section 4.

Response:

The Vernal Pike area and other at-grade intersections in urban Bloomington are recognized as high priorities in regards to safety. Please refer to AF002-23 response.

PO010-04 Comment:

- Maintaining a partial interchange at North Walnut Street is important for our community and will limit the environmental and cost impacts of a full interchange. We encourage INDOT to continue working with Monroe County officials about specific options on the North Walnut interchange. The local collaboration subgroup has been developing an innovative plan that addresses local needs and concerns and will share its ideas with INDOT.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-46 response.

PO010-05 Comment:

- We support the idea of re-using existing infrastructure to save costs when possible. In cases where overpasses or other roadways are being built or widened, we encourage the inclusion of bike/pedestrian access.



Response:

Please refer to PI046-02 response.

PO011 **12/11/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Bryan Booze, President, Windsor Private Homeowners Association

PO011-01 **Comment:**

Sound mitigation is needed for the section of I-69 to be located due west of Windsor Private (between Worms Way and The Oliver Winery). Mr. Kuchta explained the standard population density method of determining if an area typically justifies the installation of a wall, and also then stated his conclusion that sound mitigation is not justified in this instance. I am requesting a re-evaluation of this, along with the consideration of other types of sound mitigation such as construction of a ridge / berm along the easement line between the future access road (existing northbound Hwy37 lane) and the Windsor Private. Any such steps would lessen the damage to Windsor Private property that will result from the increased volume produced by I-69. To simply state that our neighborhood does not justify any sound abatement steps seems unreasonable. I am currently the President of the Windsor Private Homeowners Association (WPHA) and would enjoy the chance to work with you on this matter.

Response:

As discussed in PI049-01 response, there are specific state and federal guidelines that must be met in order to provide mitigation for noise impacts for federally-funded highway projects. (INDOT *Traffic Noise Analysis Procedure* and *23 CFR Part 772*, respectively.) Additionally, the design process will consider context sensitive roadway design in areas where it is deemed reasonable from an engineering perspective. Context sensitive design could result in lower sound levels than initially forecasted.

PO012 **12/19/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Jake Bruner, [Director of Development and Administration, Hoosier Hills Food Bank]

PO012-01 **Comment:**

Being a non-profit changing access route by even a couple miles could greatly impact us financially. With raising gas prices even a few miles extra everyday can cost us hundreds even thousands of dollars annually. This is a very negative impact for a local non-profit that serves nearly 100 agencies.

Response:

Please see PO013-01 response.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

PO013 **12/19/2012 Comment Form (Project Office)**
Dan Taylor, [Assistant Director, Hoosier Hills Food Bank]

PO013-01 **Comment:**

Make sure that Vernal Pike/17th St. can handle heavy loads. There are plenty of industrial businesses on Industrial Park Dr.

How can not proposing an Industrial Park Dr. Crossing the railroad track to Whitehall Shopping Area not be a part of this project? It will save 100's of miles, if not 1000's of miles daily in accessing I-69. The issue is created by I-69 and therefore is a part if this project.

If there was such an overpass over the railroad negotiated between the city and the railroad company would I-69 funds be available to help pay for such a project?

Response:

An Industrial Park Dr. Crossing of the railroad track to Whitehall Shopping Area has been recognized as a local issue by the city of Bloomington. It is included as a project in the in the Bloomington/Monroe County MPO's Long Range Plan. Please see PI099-01 response for additional information.

PO014 **1/2/2013 E-mail (I-69)**
Keith Vogelsang, Bloomington Bicycle Club

PO014-01 **Comment:**

On July 12, 2012, the following individuals were present at a meeting with Mary Jo Hamm and INDOT representatives: leaders of the Bloomington Bicycle Club, including president Keith Vogelsang, Vice President John Bassett, Advocacy Chair Ron Brown and others, along with Bloomington city planning Director Tom Micuda, City of Bloomington Bicycle Coordinator Vince Caristo, Monroe County Council President Geoff McKim. The purpose of this meeting was to advocate for a dedicated bicycle/pedestrian bridge to be constructed between 2nd and 3rd streets, somewhere near Basswood Drive. This section 5 Draft EIS makes no mention of the proposed bicycle bridge, as advocated by the Bloomington Bicycle Club. The Bloomington Bicycle Club, as part of the CAC, and as a matter of official club policy, want to be on record in this EIS as being in favor of building dedicated bicycle/pedestrian facilities where I-69 runs between 2nd and 3rd street. In its current form, we do not believe our position has been accurately recorded or characterized. Please update your records to reflect our official position. Thank you.

Response:

The Bloomington Bicycle Club's position is clarified in the FEIS (Section S.10.1, *Issues Raised Prior to the DEIS*; Section 4.2, *Human Environment (Community Impact Assessment)*; Section 5.3.5, *Community Facilities and Services*; and Section 11.2.2,

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations). Please note existing reference in the DEIS on page 2-8, which states: “The plan also notes a recommendation by the BMCMPPO for a separated multi-use path along I-69 throughout the Monroe County limits, and the desire for exclusive east/west bicycle and pedestrian crossings at various points along the corridor.” Please refer to PI046-02 response for more information on bicycle/pedestrian commitments.

PO015 **1/2/2013 E-mail (I-69)**
Paul Arlinghaus, Hoosier Mountain Bike Association

PO015-01 **Comment:**

I represent the Hoosier Mountain Bike Association and this comment is from HMBA-IMBA as an organization. HMBA would support Alt 8 as it does not impact the park. HMBA would consider supporting alternate 7 provided a significant part of the \$5.4M in project savings was invested in the park. The funds should be used to: a) Purchase private land that is currently used by park users (section of trail currently go on private land) b) Ensure the removal of the dam does not impact the trails (continued connectivity on the East side of the park) and has a favorable impact on the environment. c) That either fill dirt or a bridge be built to ensure trails on the West side of the property and that the North and South side of the park continue to have connectivity on the West side of the Park. d) Trail and facility improvements.

Response:

While a substantial cost savings is recognized, the investment of that savings into the park is determined by the level of impact to this resource. Please refer to AF003-02 response.

PO016 **1/2/2013 E-mail (Baker)/Letter**
Elizabeth Venstra, Bloomington Transportation Options for People (B-TOP)

PO016-01 **Comment:**

12/23/2012 Email (Elizabeth Vestra)

Attached, please find a letter from a local transportation advocacy group, Bloomington Transportation Options for People (B-TOP) in support of the bicycle/pedestrian bridge proposed by Ron Brown for the west side of Bloomington, as well as additional improvements for pedestrian safety on the 2nd and 3rd Street bridges. On behalf of the members of B-TOP, I’d like to ask you to include this letter in the official response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Section 5 of the I-69 project.

Note that B-TOP has no official position with regard to the building of any section of the I-69 interstate itself, and given that there has been speculation in the press regarding whether there is sufficient funding to build Section 5, I would like to note (as explained in the letter itself) that we believe that improvements for bicycles and pedestrians



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

should be prioritized, regardless of the outcome of the I-69 project. We need this infrastructure to get across the highway, regardless of whether it is 37 or 69. Thus, I would hope that it would become a part of any relevant transportation plans that may be made for this area apart from the I-69 design, as well as being included in the Section 5 FEIS.

We commend Mr. Brown for his tireless efforts on behalf of this project.

Response:

Comment noted. Response to specific comments follow.

PO016-02

Comment:

Undated Letter (The members of Bloomington Transportation Options for People)

Bloomington Transportation Options for People (B-TOP) expresses its support for a dedicated bicycle/pedestrian bridge over the State Road 37 and/or I-69 highway between the 2nd Street and 3rd Street interchanges. B-TOP is a non-profit organization working to bring about a more sustainable culture, better urban form, and enhanced quality of life to people in the Bloomington area by increasing use, funding, and development of alternatives to auto transport. As such, we are very interested in improving connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians between the center and west side of Bloomington.

Benefits of the bridge include:

- With the bridge, a route with low-volume streets and separated paths would connect central Bloomington to the residential areas west of Bloomington. Such a route is necessary in order to make the majority of cyclists feel comfortable that they can ride safely. Pedestrians also need a safe way to cross the highway.
- This route would link to many significant destinations along the way, including residential, recreational, retail, educational, and employment destinations. Increasing connectivity between these locations would stimulate economic activity.
- Many would be induced to engage in their east-west trips by walking and bicycling.
- The City of Bloomington has bound itself to become a Platinum-level Bicycle Friendly Community by 2016. In order to achieve this, cyclists need a safe way to cross the city between east and west.
- The Bloomington trail system would be connected to the Monroe County trail system.
- The Monroe County Alternative Transportation Plan, the Monroe County State Road 37 Corridor Plan, and the I-69/SR 37 Alternative Transportation Corridor Study have all identified crossings of SR 37/I-69 between 2nd Street and 3rd Street as the highest priority for further study.



Response:

Please refer to PI046-02 response.

PO016-03 Comment:

The bridges over the highway at both 2nd Street and 3rd Street also require sidewalks for pedestrian safety. Both bridges are currently very dangerous for pedestrians, and yet many pedestrians have no choice but to walk across them.

Response:

Please refer to PI046-02 response.

PO016-04 Comment:

It is imperative that all the bicycle and pedestrian improvements discussed above be built to cross the highway, regardless of whether I-69 Section 5 is completed as planned or not; if Section 5 is not completed in the near term for any reason, then the bicycle-pedestrian bridge should be built across State Road 37, and the existing bridges upgraded with sidewalks for pedestrian safety.

Response:

Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations that are committed to with the Refined Preferred Alternative are associated with the construction of the I-69 Section 5 project. Other improvements like a separate bike/pedestrian bridge could be developed as part of other local transportation planning efforts.

**PO017 12/22/2012 E-mail (Baker)
Ronald Brown, Bloomington Bicycle Club**

PO017-01 Comment:

12/22/2012 Email (Ronald Brown)

Attached to this email are three pdf files with comments on I-69 Section 5.

The file "I-69_Bicycle_Bridge.pdf" is a write-up with the title "Bloomington SR-37/I-69 Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge". This plan for the bridge is also found on the Bloomington Bicycle Club website with URL:

<http://bloomingtonbicycleclub.org/SR37Bridge/bridge.html>

The file "Sidepath_Rockport_Rd.pdf" is a write-up with the title "Sidepath from Clear Creek Trail Crossing I- 69 on Rockport Rd". It is a plan to allow sidepath inclined bicyclists



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

and pedestrians to go back and forth between the Clear Creek Trail and the other side of I-69.

The file "B-Line_Vernal.pdf" is a write-up with the title "Connecting the B-Line to Vernal Pike". It is a plan to extend B-Line bicycle and pedestrian traffic to Vernal Pike west of I-69.

Response:

Comment noted. The Refined Preferred Alternative accommodates bicycle and pedestrian traffic across I-69 within the construction limits. Further development of local alternative transportation plans are beyond the scope of the I-69 project. Responses to specific recommendations as applicable to I-69 follow. (Please note that each of the following attachments, including maps and aerial images, are located in FEIS Volume III Part B.)

PO017-01A Comment:

Bloomington SR-37/I-69 Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge

SR-37 serves as a bicycle barrier separating the west side of Bloomington from the rest of the city. It is so difficult to bicycle from the west side into the central city that most people would not do it. Those that do usually take a long way around using Vernal Pike on the north side or That Rd on the south side.

There is actually a second bicycle barrier, Curry Pike, which is a very busy highway running parallel to and west of SR-37. Except for Second St and Third St, with heavy traffic, there are no roads that cross Curry Pike. Between these two barriers is a business district traversed by Liberty Dr and Gates Dr. Beyond these two barriers Gifford Rd has been the only suitable road for connecting to the low volume roads and large residential neighborhoods west of Bloomington. When the Karst Trail is completed there will be a second good way of connecting to the west. The Karst Trail will connect to Sierra Dr which will lead to Curry Pike.

The solution to connecting this region west of Bloomington to central Bloomington is to route bicycles and pedestrians from the west to a properly placed bicycle/pedestrian bridge. The only good roads from the west to Curry pike will be Gifford Rd and Sierra Dr. Constitution Way is the only bicycling road available to get from Curry Pike to Liberty Dr and beyond to SR-37 where there should be a bicycle/pedestrian bridge. The other side of the bridge would connect to Basswood Dr. From there a cyclist can easily get to central Bloomington. There is a good route from the bridge to Third St now. By the summer of 2013 there will be a bicycle/pedestrian sidepath along Second St from Basswood Dr. This will give another good route into central Bloomington.

The greatest utilization of a bicycle/pedestrian route that crosses SR-37/I-69 would come from people who live in the many of homes west of Bloomington. Another large

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

group of users would be people who want to get from central Bloomington to the low volume roads west of Bloomington. I designed the bicycle/pedestrian route and bridge with these purposes in mind. For a project to be worth doing it has to be one that these people will use.

Gifford Rd and Sierra Dr will be the only good roads for bicycling west from the Liberty-Gates commercial corridor. By connecting these roads to Basswood Dr with a bicycle/pedestrian trail and bridge, people living in the residential neighborhoods west of Bloomington will be provided with a fairly direct route into central Bloomington with no or low traffic.

This map shows how these many residential neighborhoods will be connected to the route into Bloomington:

The above map also shows how cyclists and pedestrians in central Bloomington would be connected to the many low volume roads west of Bloomington. These roads include Leonard Springs Rd, Airport Rd, Vernal Pike and Woodyard Rd. Very importantly; it would provide reasonable bicycle/pedestrian access to Ivy Tech College. In addition, people living near the bridge could walk to Menards.

Even though the city plans to put bicycle lanes along Third St, it should be pointed out that there is no safe design that will get a bicycle past the curved entrance and exit ramps on the Third St Bridge (or the Second St Bridge). These ramps are nonstop with no seeing around the corner. A car will turn into a cyclist on an exit ramp. An entrance ramp places a cyclist between lanes of traffic.

On the west side of the Third St Bridge; (or the Second St Bridge) you are not where you want to be on a bicycle. You are not in a good position to get to the low volume routes west of the city. To put the bicycle/pedestrian crossing of SR-37/I-69 anywhere other than where suggested here would mean that the cyclist or pedestrian would have to go a considerable distance through traffic to connect the crossing with a west side residential neighborhood.

FROM GIFFORD RD OR SIERRA DR TO SR-37/I-69

The Figure shows the route from Gifford Rd or Sierra Dr to the SR-37/I-69 Bicycle Bridge site using Curry Pike, Constitution Way and Liberty Dr. Proposed new facilities are shown in blue. Where the route uses existing infrastructure it is show in purple. The plan calls for a bicycle side path along the west side of Curry Pike. There is a sidewalk there now. To cross Curry Pike a traffic signal is placed at Constitution Way. Along Constitution Way bicycles could ride in the quiet street while pedestrians could use the existing sidewalk. The west side of Liberty Dr from Constitution Way to the dry detention basin is very good for a bicycle/pedestrian side path. Along the way there is a wide grassy swath and very few driveway crossings. At the dry detention basin a tunnel is used to get across Liberty Dr. A bicycle/pedestrian trail is placed across the dry detention basin leading up to SR-37/I-69.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

THE I-69 BICYCLE BRIDGE

INDOT should put a bicycle/pedestrian bridge across I-69 connecting the proposed bicycle/pedestrian trail west of the highway to Basswood Dr east of the highway.

On the east side of I-69 the bridge abutment should place on a high spot. One exists just west of one of the Forest Ridge buildings.

Here is a street view showing this high spot.

The abutment for the east end of the bridge will be placed on state highway property here.

From this location at the east end of the bridge the trail goes parallel to I-69, ether north or south or both as shown here:

The route south from the abutment leads to Basswood Dr without crossing Forest Ridge property. Once on Basswood Dr there will be no problem bicycling or walking the rest of the way to downtown Bloomington. The other option goes north from the abutment and then turns east and follows the bank of a deep stream valley, one that will never be used for further development although it is on Forest Ridge property. This route also connects to Basswood Dr.

CONNECTING THE EAST END OF BRIDGE

Here is a detailed description of how the I-69 bicycle/pedestrian bridge woud interface with property to the east.

On the east side of I-69 the abutment of the bicycle/pedestrian bridge is placed on State property. For purposes of illustration I have chosen a high point. The abutment does not need to go exactly at that place. There are ramps going both north and south.

The south ramp leads to a trail which parallels I-69. This trail goes south to where state property touches Basswood Drive property. Here the trail turns toward and connects to Basswood Drive. Thus the bridge connects to a public road without impacting private property.

Using the south ramp gives the bicyclist/pedestrian a direct route to Second St via Basswood Dr. By the summer of 2013 there will be a sidepath along Second St going into central Bloomington.

Although a little less direct, the south ramp also allows the bicyclist/pedestrian to get onto Basswood Dr and travel to Third St.

The north ramp leads to a trail which runs along the bank of a deep stream valley belonging to Forest Ridge Apartments. This trail then connects to Basswood Dr giving a more direct route to Third St.



Using the north ramp takes the bicyclist/pedestrian into central Bloomington via Basswood Dr, Muller Parkway and Third St.

Response:

Please refer to PI046-02 response. In this area, bicycle and pedestrian accommodations across I-69 are provided for at Tapp Road, 2nd Street, and 3rd Street. The IDM Chapter 51-7 provides for the design of a Nonmotorized-Vehicle-Use Facility. This Section provides information on the development of facilities to enhance and encourage safe nonmotorized-vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle travel.

PO017-01B Comment:

Sidepath from Clear Creek Trail Crossing I-69 on Rockport Rd

The Fullerton Corridor Project plans to extend Fullerton Pike eastward to where it lines up with Gordon Pike. This extension will cross the Clear Creek Trail and have a sidepath to accommodate bicycles and pedestrians traveling westward from there. Where the I-69 project interfaces with the Fullerton Corridor Project it should also accommodate these side path inclined bicycles and pedestrians.

The recommended bicycle/pedestrian route from the Clear Creek Trail to Lenard Springs Rd is shown in this map:

It should be taken into account that Fullerton Pike will be a connector for people using the Clear Creek Trail. Here is a table, which appears near the beginning of the Platinum Task Force Final Report:

It shows that only 10% (=7/67) of bicyclists are comfortable riding in traffic with bike lanes. This portion will be even smaller for the type of people that use the Clear Creek Trail. They will prefer or require a bicycle/pedestrian sidepath along Fullerton Pike. Accordingly the Fullerton Corridor Project has this sidepath.

There will be an interchange where Fullerton Pike intersects I-69. It will not be possible to run the sidepath through this interchange. To avoid the interchange the sidepath should cross I-69 on Rockport Rd. After being led west from the Clear Creek Trail on a bicycle/pedestrian sidepath, it is expected that the bicyclists be able to cross I-69 on a bridge with a sidepath. To avoid the Fullerton Pike interchange the bicycles and pedestrians should be routed along Rockport Rd and cross I-69 on that road's grade separated bridge.

The DEIS shows I-69 construction from Fullerton Pike to the Rockport Rd bridge. That construction should include a bicycle/pedestrian sidepath both along Rockport Rd and on the bridge.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

After crossing the Rockport Rd bridge the bicyclists will get back to Fullerton Pike riding Monroe Medical Park Blvd on-road. This anticipates the future extension of this boulevard to Rockport Rd.

Response:

Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are provided in accordance with the recommendations made by Monroe County. Bicycle/pedestrian accommodations within I-69 construction limits on Rockport Road include a 5-foot paved shoulder. Please refer to PI046-02 response.

PO017-01C

Comment:

Connecting the B-Line to Vernal Pike

Vernal Pike is the SR-37 crossing most heavily used by bicycle. It is the only reasonable way to reach much of Bloomington to the west. To get to destinations north west of Bloomington many BBC rides are taking the B-Line to its north end and then connecting with Vernal Pike. Many other cyclists are doing the same thing to get to destinations west of SR-37.

Looking to the I-69 future, the B-Line to Vernal Pike connection will be very important. I-69 will close the current Vernal Pike crossing. This will make it a very low traffic road east of I-69. Thus it will make a very good bicycle route. It will serve as an extension to the B-Line. I will call this road Old Vernal Pike. Here it is shown in an areal photo:

The above areal photo shows how Vernal Pike lines up with 17th St. They are connected to each other via what I call New Vernal Pike, which takes a bridge over I-69. A BICYCLE PATH SHOULD BE PLACED ALONG I-69 CONNECTING OLD VERNAL PIKE TO NEW VERNAL PIKE. The result would be an extension to the B-Line that goes to the destinations north west of Bloomington.

It would be helpful to extend the B-Line straight ahead for one more block to Vernal Pike. This would be short and direct. In addition, it would not cross the tracks.

The result would look like this:

With the city putting in one block of B-Line and INDOT connecting Old Vernal Pike to New Vernal Pike we would have an excellent extension of the B-Line that would connect to the bicycle/pedestrian sidepath along Vernal Pike west of I-69. This would lead to the Will Detmer Park, the Karst Trail and other destinations to the north west.

Response:

Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are provided on 17th Street within the I-69 project limits in accordance with recommendations made by the City of Bloomington. Please refer to PI046-02 response.



PO018 **1/2/2013 E-mail (Baker)/Letter**
Tim Maloney, Senior Policy Director, Hoosier Environmental Council

PO018-01 **Comment:**

[1/2/2013 E-mail (Maloney)]

Our comments are attached.

[1/2/2013 Letter (Maloney)]

The Hoosier Environmental Council ("HEC") formally submits the following comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("DEIS") for Section 5 of the I-69 Project.

Incorporation of comments on Tier 1 FEIS

HEC incorporates by reference its comments on the Tier 1 EIS and selection of the new-terrain (3C) route for I-69. In summary, the FEIS:

- a) Contained a flawed purpose and need statement, which was biased toward a new-terrain route;
- b) Failed to rigorously explore and evaluate alternatives, including the U.S. 41/I-70 upgrade alternative;
- c) Failed to accurately measure environmental and other relevant impacts; and,
- d) Failed to comply with other binding laws, including the Clean Water Act.

Response:

These comments were fully considered in the Tier 1 FEIS. Most of them also were addressed in subsequent litigation in which the commenter was the lead plaintiff. On December 10, 2007, the district court issued a decision rejecting all of the plaintiffs' claims (Hoosier Environmental Council, et al. v. U.S. Department of Transportation, et al., S.D. Ind., Civ. No. 1:06-cv-1442, December 10, 2006). Plaintiffs did not file an appeal; therefore, the District Court's decision is final. On April 17, 2007, FHWA issued a "Notice of Final Federal Agency Actions on Proposed Highway in Indiana," which established a 180-day period in which to seek judicial review of decisions made in Tier 1, including both the Tier 1 ROD and Revised Tier 1 BO. (72 Fed. Reg. 19228 – April 17, 2007). At no time did the plaintiffs in the Tier 1 litigation challenge the decision to divide Tier 2 into six sections of independent utility. Because the district court's decision is final, and the time for other judicial challenges to the Tier 1 decisions expired on October 14, 2007, no further legal challenges can be brought against these Tier 1 decisions.

In addition, three of the six sections of independent utility established in the Tier 1 FEIS and ROD have been built and are open to traffic. Construction of the fourth section is underway. Returning to an analysis of alternative corridors would not provide any relevant information for the decisionmaker for the Section 5 project.



PO018-02 **Comment:**

Comments specific to Tier 2, Section 5 DEIS

Chapter 2 - Purpose and Need

Local Needs

Segmentation of a large project is permitted if local needs justify it, but INDOT made minimal effort to independently justify the segment encompassed by Section 5. (See Section 2.1.2). The primary criteria used to determine the segments were the Tier 1 purpose and need goals. INDOT only included local needs which served to support the overall project goals identified in Tier 1. (Pg. 2-2). There is no evidence that Section 5 would meet a demonstrated local transportation need if the other sections of I-69 were not completed.

One outcome of this inappropriate segmentation process is that the project's full environmental impact is not known nor disclosed until all six of the Tier 2 environmental impact statements are completed. Had the complete environmental impact of the project been identified in Tier 1, the basis for selecting a different alternative such as I-70 and US 41 would have been even more compelling. Although the tiering process was approved in earlier litigation, the court worried that it "may result in a 'shell game' if not carefully managed." *Hoosier Environmental Council, et al. v. U.S. Department of Transportation, et al.*, Civ. No.1:06-cv-1442, pg.19, (S.D.Ind. 2006). With the release of each subsequent Tier 2 study, the environmental footprint and cost estimates continue to balloon. Regardless of the substance of the Tier 2 studies, though, the route choice made at the Tier 1 level has never been reconsidered by INDOT, FHWA, the Army Corps of Engineers, or any other regulating agency. This is exactly the kind of "impermissible" result segmentation the Court warned against. *Id.*

Response:

Please refer to PO018-01 response.

PO018-03 **Comment:**

None of these local needs are sufficient to justify considering Section 5 independent of the entire project. The DEIS identifies four local needs justifying the Section 5 segment. (Pg. 2-4). They are:

- Complete Section 5 of I-69 as determined in the Tier 1 ROD
- Reduce existing and forecasted traffic congestion
- Improve traffic safety
- Support local economic development initiatives

These are virtually the same generic "local needs" used to justify Sections 1 through 4, and which generally repeat the broader needs identified for the entire corridor in Tier 1.



Response:

The Tier 1 FEIS determined Tier 2 sections, each of which has an independent transportation purpose. See Tier 1 FEIS, Section 3.5, *Tier 2 Sections*. Each Tier 2 Section, including Section 5, satisfies the criteria specified in 23 CFR 771.111(f), which includes that it have independent utility or independent significance. The Tier 1 litigation (described in the PO018-01 response) determined that FHWA's and INDOT's use of tiering is appropriate. The opinion issued in this litigation also found that the Tier 1 Purpose and Need, which is the basis of the purpose and need in individual Tier 2 sections, was appropriate.

PO018-04 Comment:

Local Need# 1 -Completion of Section 5

Completion of Section 5 itself cannot be a local need since segmentation itself is supposed to be validated through the consideration of local needs. It is a circular argument to assert that the Section 5 segment serves the local need of completing Section 5.

INDOT continues to incorrectly state that "Section 5 of I-69 responds to the Congressional policy to complete the National I-69 Corridor." (Pg. 2-13). The "High Priority Corridor" identified by Congress does not mandate that the corridor connect Bloomington to Martinsville. The corridor identified by Congress extends from Evansville to Indianapolis, but the route that corridor follows is not specified.

Response:

The Tier 1 ROD (Section 2.1.1) selected a "build" alternative for the I-69, Evansville to Indianapolis project. Further, the ROD determined that it would connect Bloomington and Martinsville (Section 2.1.2). It approved the termini for Section 5 from Bloomington to Martinsville in Section 2.3.2. The need to complete Section 5 with its current termini was established in the Tier 1 ROD. No further Tier 2 analysis is required of the boundaries of the Section 5 corridor or its termini.

PO018-05 Comment:

Local Need# 2 - Reduce Congestion

Section 2.3.2 predicts high levels of congestion on major highways in the region leading to poor functionality by 2035. Since a final determination has yet to be made regarding local road closures, it is not possible to accurately predict future congestion levels on every highway and other road in the region. Without this level of detailed study, it is impossible to assert with any level of reliability that congestion will be eased over time by constructing Section 5.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Moreover, many of the road segments listed as having future undesirable Levels of Service are roads whose traffic levels will be entirely unaffected by the construction of I-69 in Section 5. Several of these roads unlikely to be affected by I-69 are:

- SR 446 from Moores Pike to Swartz Ridge Road- LOS D
- SR 46 from Getty's Creek Road to Brown County Line- LOS D/E
- SR 67 from Owen County Line to West Street - LOS D
- SR 252 from Cramertown Loop to SR 135 "LOS D/E
- SR 46 at Morgan County Line - LOS D [*SR 46 does not enter Morgan County at all*]
- SR 135 at Morgan County Line- LOS D

The inclusion of a road segment that does not even exist – SR 46 at Morgan County line – makes this entire analysis suspect.

Response:

The reference to “SR 46 at Morgan County Line” is a typographical error. It should read “SR 46 at Monroe County Line.” This has been corrected in the FEIS.

The roads cited in this comment, along with many others, are listed in Section 2.3.2 to demonstrate that congested conditions exist in the forecast year “No Build” condition, and that accordingly there is a need to reduce congestion. A major added capacity transportation project such as I-69 has significant potential to provide traffic congestion relief across a very wide area. Section 3.3.1.1, *Congestion* (see Tables 3-7 and 3-8), documents that various Section 5 alternatives are forecasted to result in substantial reductions in congested travel conditions throughout Morgan and Monroe counties. I-69 will not **eliminate** congestion in these counties in the forecast year; it will serve to **reduce** congestion in the forecast year. As the comment points out, some roads listed may not have congestion alleviated by I-69.

PO018-06

Comment:

Local Need #3 -Improve Traffic Safety

The DEIS (Sec. 2.3.3) relies on outdated and incomplete safety information used in the Tier 1 EIS. INDOT should revise their safety analysis based on current data, and more specifically identify any safety issues that may be present on existing roadways.

Moreover, INDOT has described several features in its low cost design standards that can affect highway safety. These include median width, inside and outside shoulder width, interchange design, maximum grade, critical length of grade, rock cut slope, guardrail embankment height and grading behind guardrail, and road surface material. The features of the actual highway to be built must be considered and studied before the claim can be reliably made that the highway will improve traffic safety.

Response:

Table 2-1 includes current crash data for Indiana Highways from sources dated between 2008 and 2010; Tier 1 information is not used in the referenced table. Section 3.3.1.2,

**Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement**

Safety, provides further information specific to Section 5. Traffic data and projections including current crash data were updated and analyzed for Section 5. With each safety feature, INDOT and FHWA require minimum design criteria be met throughout the length of the project. In some limited instances, conditions may exist that warrant alternative design considerations due to environmental impacts, impacts to natural resources, existing terrain constraints, right-of-way impacts, costs, or a combination of several of the above. To evaluate alternative design considerations, a benefit–cost evaluation is made for each element. The element is considered as a possible design exception only if it is determined that it is cost effective; that cost savings from the design element are greater than any safety-related costs. These decisions to implement alternative design considerations are documented in Appendix EE. Details of these findings are included in the design engineer’s report.

PO018-07 Comment:Local Need #4- Local Economic Development

Again, the study conflates federal and state highway priorities with local needs. None of the local studies cited in the DEIS identified local needs independent of the entire I-69 project. All of the county and city economic development plans and studies contemplated how best to capitalize on the I-69 project. These studies do not call for the construction of Section 5 - they simply identify ways for local communities to adapt their development plans to accommodate I-69.

Response:

As documented in the Tier 1 study, significant additional economic development will result throughout southwest Indiana from the construction of I-69. In Monroe County alone, it found that annual disposable personal income would increase by \$18.4 million (2000 dollars), and lead to the creation of over 500 permanent jobs which would not exist without I-69 (Tier 1 FEIS, Table 3-26b). By choosing to capitalize on I-69, these local plans seek to guide the economic development which occurs with the I-69 project in a manner that best addresses local priorities.

PO018-08 Comment:Chapter 5 - Environmental Consequences*Air Quality*

The DEIS (page 5.9-9) states that the portion of Section 5 in Morgan County is in a non-attainment area for PM2.5, and that a determination will be made later if a "quantitative PM2.5 analysis is appropriate." Since interagency consultation was not begun until shortly before the release of the DEIS, and no detailed analysis of the effects of I-69 construction on PM2.5 levels in Morgan County has been completed, the public has been provided no meaningful information on this possible impact of the project. Therefore, the FEIS should not be completed until the public has had a chance to review and comment on the PM2.5 analysis.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

For I-69 project impacts on ozone levels, the DEIS provides conflicting information about the status of a transportation conformity determination for I-69. On pages 5.9-2 to 3, the DEIS reports that "FHWA will no longer need to demonstrate conformity to the ozone SIP for Central Indiana (including Morgan County) once the 1997 8-hour Ozone Standard is revoked for purposes of demonstrating conformity." Yet on pages 5.9-9 and 10, the DEIS states that "The conformity determination requirements for the I-69 Tier 2 Section 5 project will be made after further interagency consultation. Consultation will be completed prior to the ROD." The DEIS should be revised to clarify the status of conformity with the ozone SIP, and if further analysis is required, this should be made available to the public for review and comment prior to any action finalizing the EIS.

Response:

In regards to PM2.5, coordination with the interagency group has continued as part of the FEIS development in order to determine the methods and procedures used for conducting the analysis presented in the FEIS. The ICG noted that the project is located in a PM2.5 nonattainment area (Morgan County) with an increase in the number of diesel vehicles expected in future years. The ICG agreed that a project level PM2.5 hot-spot analysis would be conducted for I-69 Section 5 although the group did not conclude that the project was a Project of Air Quality Concern. A two week public comment period on the draft report was offered and concluded on June 14, 2013. No comments were received during the comment period. I-69 Section 5 conforms to all applicable project level conformity requirements. Conformity findings and supporting documentation are included in *Appendix OO* of the Section 5 FEIS.

The ozone paragraph with the text on DEIS pages 5.9-9 and 10 has been removed/reworded. The conformity determination only applies to PM2.5.

PO018-09 Comment

Energy impacts

The DEIS reflects that building of the preferred alternative will increase energy consumption in the study area: by 26% in Monroe County, and by 32% in Morgan County, by the year 2035, compared to not building the highway. (Pg. 5.25-2). This will result in an increase in carbon emissions at a time when the U.S. Department of Transportation is seeking ways to reduce the carbon footprint of transportation.

Response:

As explained in Section 5.25.3, *Analysis*, the increase in VMT includes the additional lane miles added to the roadway network and the diversion of through traffic from other interstates and principal arterials, including the diversion of through traffic from outside of Morgan and Monroe counties.



PO018-10 **Comment:**

Forest Impacts

The DEIS reports that the preferred alternative will have substantial impacts on forest lands. Over 256 acres of forest will be destroyed for the highway right of way. Much of this forest is high quality hardwood forest. The DEIS analysis of indirect, induced growth effects on the forest resources in Section 5 is inadequate, and relied on a limited information source for its analysis.

Forest impacts in Section 5 identified in the Tier 2 DEIS increased nearly three-fold from the forest impacts identified in Tier 1 (page S-56), further demonstrating the inadequacy of the tiering process in fully disclosing the environmental impacts of the I-69 project.

Response:

Section 5.24.2, *Methodology*, identifies the updated source of data available for and used in the Tier 2 Section 5 analysis (2006 NLCD Zone 49 available February 16, 2011) and guidance for the 11-step process used to conduct the indirect and cumulative analysis. The land cover data is the best available data available for the Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs) which are anticipated to experience induced growth. The Tier 2 process used the same base traffic modeling tools and forecasting methodologies as were used in Tier 1 for consistency. Regional induced growth in housing units and employment was allocated to each TAZ through the use of Expert Land Use Panels with representatives from Monroe County, Bloomington-Monroe Metropolitan Planning Organization (BMCMPPO), City of Bloomington, Town of Ellettsville, Morgan County, City of Martinsville, Bloomington Board of Realtors, Indiana University, local real estate offices, and other stakeholder groups with knowledge of local land uses. They determined that indirect impacts would differ among alternatives based upon the different interchanges that each provides.

The Tier 1 forest impact estimate was 90 acres. Tier 1 impacts were estimated using existing GIS data layers. For forests this was the United States Geological Survey (USGS) National Land Cover Data (NLCD). The land-cover layer was based on 30 X 30 meter squares and was a consistent data source for the entire Tier 1 study area. In Tier 1, impacts were determined using a general working alignment with an approximate 10 acre-footprint at proposed interchange locations. This working alignment only included an estimate of *additional* right-of-way necessary for the highway. In Tier 2, more detailed alignments using actual interchange configurations and local access roads, were used to determine forest impacts. In addition, the location of forest land use was determined using aerial photography and field surveys, rather than the more generalized dataset used in Tier 1. And finally, the Tier 2 impacts include forests within the existing SR 37 right-of-way, which the Tier 1 estimates did not. For the DEIS Preferred Alternative 8, forests within the existing right-of-way total approximately 128 acres. The combination of a more detailed alternative alignment, more detailed forest data, and the inclusion of forest within the existing SR 37 right-of-way results in higher forest impacts in Tier 2 when compared to the Tier 1 estimate. Since this project utilizes



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

an existing alignment, impacts to forests were minimized to the extent practical. See Section 6.4.2, *Preferred Alternative Costs and Impacts Compared with Tier 1 Estimates*, for discussion of changes in estimated forest impacts between Tier 1 and Tier 2.

PO018-11 Comment:

Karst Impacts

The preferred Section 5 alignment will cross a region with a high density of karst features. 110 karst features are along the Section 5 corridor. While a majority of these features lie within the existing SR 37 corridor, the construction of I-69 with new frontage roads and interchanges will significantly increase the impacts to karst resources in south-central Indiana. Coupled with the substantial impacts to karst resources from the Section 4 new-terrain construction, the I-69 project will represent a major impact to Indiana's unique and sensitive karst terrain. The Section 5 DEIS fails to analyze any alternative which would significantly avoid further impacts to karst features.

Response:

Alternatives follow the SR-37 right-of-way, which minimizes impacts to karst features not already impacted. See Table 5.21-4, which shows that only 30% of karst features impacted by the Refined Preferred Alternative of Section 5 project are outside of the existing SR 37 right-of-way.

The corridor selection in Tier 1 anticipated there would be significant numbers of karst features potentially impacted (see Tier 1 FEIS Section 5.23.3, Karst Impacts). Please refer to PO018-01 in regards to Tier 1 corridor decisions. Figure 5.23-5 in the Tier 1 FEIS shows cave densities (a significant karst feature) in the area. Significant concentrations of these features were known to be near Preferred Alternative 3C. As such, Tier 2 alternatives were developed within the 2000-ft corridor identified in the Tier 1 ROD for Section 5. Alternatives with the fewest karst impacts were those that used the greatest amount of the existing SR 37 right-of-way and pavement and the least amount of interchanges, overpasses, and local access roads in the karst portions of Section 5. While Alternative 6 had fewer karst impacts (see the FEIS Table 5.21-4: Potential Karst Feature Impact Summary), Refined Preferred Alternative 8 includes additional right-of-way along SR 45/2nd Street and SR 48/3rd Street to accommodate bicycle, pedestrian, access, and local service road connection considerations. While there is a corresponding increase in karst impacts with these features that are not included in the other five alternatives; similar karst impacts to karst features would occur if these same bicycle, pedestrian, access, and local service road connection considerations were applied to Alternatives 4 through 8.

The Refined Preferred Alternative 8 has slightly higher karst impacts than either Alternative 6, 7, or 8, with 110 features and 347.3 acres of impact and had the least impact to the Cave A recharge area of concern. Refined Preferred Alternative 8 had the fewest karst impacts while still meeting local transportation plans, local government



access input, 2035 traffic forecasts, and safety considerations. The Refined Preferred Alternative avoids further impacts to karst features where practicable.

PO018-12 Comment:

Wildlife Impacts

Federally Endangered Species

The DEIS is inadequate in its analysis of impacts to federally endangered species, particularly the Indiana bat. INDOT's flawed tiering process failed to disclose the full impacts of the project on the Indiana bat or allow avoidance of these impacts by choosing the least damaging alternative. The Tier 1 EIS and BA did not identify or disclose that 14 maternity colonies exist along the route. (p 5.17-7 and 8). The differences in the quality and extent of information on Indiana bat presence, and on karst features (as discussed below), between the Tier 1 EIS and the Tier 2 studies, highlights the deficiencies with INDOT's tiered planning process.

Response:

The DEIS discusses impacts to the Indiana bat in Sections 5.17.1 – 5.17.3. Both formal and informal Section 7 consultation regarding impacts to federally listed species has occurred throughout Tier 1 and Tier 2 of this project. This information has been updated in Section 5.17, *Bald Eagles, Federal and State Threatened and Endangered Species*, of the FEIS.

Specific to Section 5 Tier 2, the FEIS includes the I-69 Section 5 Tier 2 Biological Assessment (BA) in Appendix LL1 which includes a detailed analysis on impacts to the Indiana bat. In its Section 5 Tier 2 Biological Opinion (BO) issued July 25, 2013, (see Appendix LL2), the USFWS noted that "Section 5 of the I-69 Project, by itself or when considered in conjunction with the larger I-69 project from Evansville to Indianapolis, is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the Indiana bat" (pg. 59). USFWS further stated, "Based on our analysis, we do not believe that the proposed action 'would be expected, directly or indirectly, to reduce appreciably the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of the Indiana bat by reducing the reproduction, numbers, or distribution of the Indiana bat (50 CFR 402)'" (pg. 60). (pg. 58). The issuance of the BO concluded formal Section 7 consultation in I-69 Section 5. The Section 5 Tier 2 BO confirmed the Indiana bat may be adversely affected and ensured the level of effect is commensurate with the revised Tier 1 BO and amendments discussed further in the following paragraph. This verifies the determination that I-69 Section 5 will not jeopardize the continued existence of the Indiana bat.

In regards to Tier 1 consultation, the Tier 1 Biological Assessment (BA) Addendum and revised Tier 1 BO identified 13 maternity colonies along the preferred corridor. In the revised Tier 1 BO, the USFWS concurred that the I-69 project is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the Indiana bat and is not likely to adversely modify the bats' designated critical habitat. The District Court considered the information in the revised



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

Tier 1 BO in ruling in favor of INDOT and FHWA in the litigation brought by HEC challenging the Tier 1 decision.

An additional maternity colony was identified in Section 4 during mist netting in 2010, bringing the project-wide total to 14 colonies. Tier 1 consultation for the entire I-69 project was reinitiated in part due to this new colony. On May 25, 2011, the USFWS issued an Amendment to the August 24, 2006 revised Tier 1 BO, including a revised Incidental Take Statement. This Amendment stated, “the Service determined that the aggregate level of anticipated take is not likely to result in jeopardy to Indiana bats or destruction or adverse modification of designated Critical Habitat.” Impacts to this colony were analyzed in the section-specific Section 4 Tier 2 BA dated November 1, 2010. The USFWS has also taken into account potential impacts to the Indiana bat population and provide a species determination in the Section 4 Tier 2 BO (July 6, 2011).

Also, two additional Indiana bat maternity colonies were identified in Section 5 during mist netting efforts in 2012. This brings the total number of Indiana bat colonies in Section 5 to three and the total number project-wide to 16. On July 24, 2013, as a result of reinitiating Tier 1 consultation for the Indiana bat based on new maternity colony information, exempted levels of forest and wetland take, and documentation on private property tree clearing in Section 4, the USFWS issued an Amendment 2 to the August 24, 2006 revised Tier 1 BO, including a revised Incidental Take Statement. This Amendment 2 to the revised Tier 1 BO stated, “the Service determined that the aggregate level of anticipated take is not likely to result in jeopardy to Indiana bats or destruction or adverse modification of designated Critical Habitat.”

PO018-13 **Comment:**

State Endangered Species and Species of Concern

Section 5 includes three species of birds affected by the corridor and insufficiently considered in the DEIS. The Barn Owl (state endangered species), Henslow's Sparrow (state endangered species), and Red-shouldered Hawk (special concern) are all likely to have breeding ground destroyed by construction of I-69.

The DEIS discloses that the Section 5 area has a rich community of native bat species, including the state-endangered evening bat. The additional impacts to forest and other habitats resulting from construction of I-69 will likely have adverse impacts on these bat communities.

Response:

Section 5.17.3.3, *State-Listed Species*, of the DEIS acknowledges that impacts are possible to the three bird species due to potential habitat impacts. The DEIS also acknowledges impacts to native bat species are possible, but impacts to regional populations of the species are not expected. .



PO018-14 Comment:

Quality of Biological Information and Surveys

INDOT surveys for fish and wildlife species in the Section 5 corridor were inadequate to disclose the full effects of the preferred highway alternative. The discussion of potential impacts to listed species is cursory.

The "generalized pedestrian surveys" to determine the presence of wildlife species were limited and incomplete, and very likely to overlook the presence of species in suitable habitats along the highway corridor. (Pg. 5.17-14).

More thorough studies are needed to fully document the impacts of the proposed highway on sensitive, rare and endangered fish and wildlife species.

Response:

As explained in the FEIS Section 5.17.2, *Methodology*, species-specific surveys were completed for the Section 5 project area after consultation with the USFWS. These included Indiana bat mist netting in the summers of 2004 and 2005, as well as in the summer of 2012. Bat harp trapping and cave surveys were also completed for areas that were determined (through coordination with USFWS) to be potential habitat for the Indiana Bat. Detailed information about these bat surveys are in Appendix O, *Indiana Bat Surveys*. Cave biological surveys were completed for the three caves that are located within or close proximity to the Section 5 corridor as part of the karst studies. A detailed description of these surveys can be found in Appendix Y, *Final Karst Report (Redacted)*. Fish, Mussel, and Crayfish surveys were completed in 2004 and 2005 for the streams in the Section 5 study area, including Griffey Creek, Beanblossom Creek, the north tributary to Beanblossom Creek, an unnamed tributary to Bryant Creek, Bryant Creek, Little Indian Creek, Jordan Creek, and Indian Creek. Appendix HH details the survey methods and results for the fish, mussel, and crayfish surveys.

In addition to the specific surveys, generalized pedestrian surveys were done in September of 2004 and June of 2005. Wetland, stream, and forest field surveys were also completed for the Section 5 study area. The presence or absence of species was noted during all of these field surveys, and many of the floral species in the Section 5 corridor were identified during these surveys. However, as noted in the FEIS (Section 5.17.2.1, *Endangered Species Surveys*) many floral species are inconspicuous during certain times of the years and are only readily visible while in bloom or when the fruit has matured. In addition, certain species of wildlife may be conspicuous and readily observed, but the majority of species are inconspicuous and elusive. Although the generalized pedestrian, wetland, stream, and forest surveys can include actual sightings, more pertinent data is developed from identifying and characterizing the habitat types located within the project area. This information is documented in the FEIS (Section 5.18.2.1, *Habitat Types and Associated Species*) along with the specific habitat requirements of the species and prior documented occurrences was used to determine the potential occurrence of species in the study area.



PO018-15 **Comment:**

Chapter 6 - Comparison of Alternatives

Cost Comparisons

The DEIS discloses that the cost of building Section 5 has increased substantially over the cost projections provided in Tier 1. The cost estimate increases, adjusted for inflation, range from 14 to 25% more than originally anticipated in Tier 1 (See Table 6-11, pg. 6-55). The DEIS justifies the increase in part by noting that three items (utility relocation, mitigation costs, and construction administration costs) were not included in the Tier 1 estimates. The fact that so much of the anticipated costs of Section 5 were not even considered at the Tier 1 level should be sufficient to restart the corridor selection process.

Response:

Tier 1 cost estimates provided comparable costs appropriate for use in the comparison of alternatives for a Tier 1 analysis. As explained in the FEIS, Section 6.4.2, *Preferred Alternative Costs and Impacts Compared with Tier 1 Estimates*, the Tier 2 cost estimates for the Section 5 alternatives were calculated in Year 2012 dollars, and escalated to Year 2015 at an annual inflation rate of 3.5%. The Tier 1 estimates were in Year 2000 dollars and also escalated at the same inflation rate of 3.5%. **Table 6-11** shows that the Tier 1 construction and right-of-way cost estimates ranged between \$438 and \$474 million. At \$394 million, the Refined Preferred Alternative is well below the estimated Tier 1 estimate, even with the addition of utility relocation, construction administration, and mitigation costs.

PO018-16 **Comment:**

The DEIS contains no discussion of the likelihood of all 6 sections of I-69 being funded. A specific funding source for Section 5 has not been identified (meaning it is not fiscally constrained), and further planning activities on Section 6 have been deferred indefinitely, according to the DEIS.

Based on information contained in INDOT's financial plans for Section 1 to 4, INDOT will siphon over 60% (\$903 million) of the total projected costs of Sections 1-4 (\$1.485 billion) from state and federal gas tax revenues. Gas tax revenues are the main funding source for all other state highway, bridge, and safety projects.

Given the rising construction costs, likely reductions in features that will affect project performance, and the diversion of funds from other state projects, INDOT should re-evaluate the entire I-69 project to determine if it is cost effective and justified.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-23 response regarding funding of Section 5. Additionally, Section 1 through 3 are completed and open to traffic. Section 4 is fully funded, and is under



construction in its entirety. With regard to Section 6, Governor Pence has identified completion of I-69 as a priority. “Since I believe roads mean jobs, I think one of the historic contributions of the Daniels administration has been to make such measurable progress in completing I-69,” Pence said in mid-December. “We’re going to finish that work. We’re going to find out where to do it, we’re going to find out how to do it, but we’re going to do it.”¹ The Refined Preferred Alternative satisfies the project goals outlined in Section 2.5, *Project Goals and Performance Measures*.

PO018-17 Comment:

Comparison of Tier 1 FEIS Costs and Impacts to those of Tier 2 Preferred Alternative

Table 6-11 of the DEIS reveals that many of the impacts of Section 5 are greater than those projected in the Tier 1 FEIS. The total number of acres of forest to be cut down has increased to approximately 250 acres, nearly a three-fold increase. Wetlands impacts, residential and business displacements all increased over Tier 1 estimates.

The disparity is primarily attributed to the level of detail in the Tier 1 and Tier 2 analyses. This illustrates a main flaw in the tiering process used for studying I-69, and highlights the fact that the route corridor for I-69 was selected without knowing the full impacts of the highway. Moreover, the full impacts are still unknown since the Tier 2 DEIS for Section 6 has yet to be completed or published.

Response:

Section 6.4.2 of the FEIS compares estimates provided during Tier 1 and Tier 2 studies and explains the increase or decrease. Forest is the only category to increase. As shown in Table 6-11, project costs, right-of-way acquisition, displacements, wetlands, floodplains, and farmland impacts for the Tier 2 Refined Preferred Alternative are lower than the Tier 1 FEIS estimates.

Please see PO018-01 response in regards Tier 1 to corridor selection.

PO018-18 Comment:

Chapter 7 -- Mitigation and Commitments

Forest/Wildlife Habitat Mitigation

The preferred alternative will destroy between 246 and 250 acres of forest and between 6 and 10 acres of wetlands. The proposed mitigation is inadequate to replace the lost habitats. Forest habitats will be "replaced" at only a 1:1 ratio, with another 2:1 ratio for "preserving" existing forest through purchase. Purchasing existing forest provides no net gain of forest land; it just prevents additional future loss. The proposed mitigation practice does not represent a true 3:1 replacement ratio, which should require that 3

¹ News article, [Pence reaffirms commitment to finishing I-69](#), as cited in online version of *New Albany Tribune and Jeffersonville (IN) Evening News*, December 29, 2012.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

acres of forest be re-created through plantings for every 1 acre destroyed. Even at a 3 to 1 ratio, the function of a mature forest will take 100 years or more to replace. (Pg. 7-7).

Proposed mitigation measures for impacts to the Indiana bat are not sufficient nor assured. The shortcomings of the proposed forest mitigation as described above, and the fact that purchase and/ or protection of proposed mitigation properties for Section 5 impacts is not complete, are examples of the mitigation plans' weaknesses.

Response:

Non-wetland forest mitigation is being completed in coordination with the regulatory agencies. The mitigation ratios have previously been approved by the regulatory agencies as part of Tier 1 and reconfirmed in Tier 2. These ratios will also apply to Section 5.

PO018-19

Comment:

Community Planning

The DEIS claims that INDOT's support for community planning along the I-69 route is another form of mitigation. (Pg. 7-8). This planning, in the form of a comprehensive plan and/or zoning ordinances, is inherently uncertain and impermanent, and doesn't guarantee that additional impacts to forests and wetlands from induced growth will not occur. Comprehensive plan provisions or ordinances related to I-69 may not be enforced; and I-69 related provisions or ordinances now in place at INDOT's urging could be changed in the future.

Response:

The I-69 Community Planning Program was established to set in place a regional strategy for providing resources to local communities to manage growth and economic development associated with the interstate. The Planning Program included the development of a planning toolbox and a grant program. The planning toolbox focused on five categories: resource protection, growth management, economic development, transportation and infrastructure impacts, and increasing local planning capacity. Essentially, the toolbox provided local communities with a tool that would help them assess their current level of planning capacity so they could make a determination on how best to proceed with their grant application.

Thirty-one communities were identified during Tier 1 studies as eligible to apply for up to \$50,000 apiece to complete local plans or growth management ordinances. The City of Bloomington was the only eligible community that opted not pursue this funding. The 30 remaining communities applied for and were awarded grants to complete plans ranging from comprehensive plans to corridor studies.

As a result of this program some communities in southwest Indiana (for the first time ever) developed and adopted comprehensive plans and established plan commissions to



Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

serve as a reviewing and recommending bodies for future development within their respective counties.

While there is no guarantee that these communities will advance from this point by implementing further protections through zoning and ordinances, adopting a comprehensive plan and seating a plan commission are two prerequisite steps before that could occur. Further, protections and considerations identified within comprehensive plans serve as guidance for elected officials charged with the responsibility of adopting ordinances and managing growth and development in the absence of zoning requirements.

There are other examples where the program has served to manage growth and development where local communities identified areas to expand water, sewer, and other key infrastructure to encourage development in targeted locations, thus discouraging growth and development in areas that are less desirable due to potential impacts to key natural resources.

Ultimately, the Community Planning Program has empowered local communities to take the initiative to plan for their future and implement controls to stimulate and manage growth.

PO018-20 Comment:

Mitigation for Karst Impacts

The DEIS assumes that reliance on the Interagency Karst Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will provide adequate mitigation for karst impacts. It concedes that in Tier 2, avoidance of karst terrain is not possible. (Pg. 7-53).

Because of INDOT's flawed tiering process, it selected a highway corridor in Tier 1 without knowing its full impacts on the karst resources in Greene and Monroe Counties. Thus INDOT is now limited by its Tier 1 corridor selection which crosses an area with a high density of karst features. The only way to avoid these impacts is to consider a Tier 2 alignment outside of the Tier 1 corridor, which is an option available to INDOT.

Reliance on the terms of the MOU is uncertain and provides no guarantee that the damage to karst features will be minimized or mitigated to the fullest extent. Completion of the remaining 13 MOU steps will not take place until after the environmental study is final and design and construction is underway. Many of these subsequent MOU steps require intensive involvement with the project by staff of the IDNR, IDEM and U.S. FWS. This assumes that these agencies have the staff and resources needed to carry out their obligations under the MOU for this project. Both IDNR and IDEM have experienced significant budget cuts in the past several years and thus their capacity to meet these obligations is in question. This uncertainty makes the proposed karst mitigation plans speculative and arbitrary.



Response:

Please see PO018-11 response in regards to Karst Impacts and Tier 1 decisions. IDNR, IDEM and USFWS have regulatory responsibilities pertaining to this resource and have agreed to the terms of the MOU. The I-69 Section 4 MOU process has involved substantial resource agency coordination and input from IDNR, IDEM, and USFWS. Likewise, it is expected that these agencies will continue to have an active role in subsequent steps of the Section 5 MOU process.

PO018-21

Comment:

Section 4(f) Department of Transportation Act Lands

The DEIS improperly finds that Morgan-Monroe State Forest lands are not eligible for protection from "use" under Section 4(f). The DEIS incorrectly states that no management plan was available for the state forest, and that it is not used for recreational activities. This is wrong on both counts. In 2008, the IDNR adopted a Division of Forestry Strategic Plan, which provides management guidance for the publicly-owned Indiana State Forests, including Morgan-Monroe State Forest, and effectively serves as the management plan for the Indiana State Forests. In this plan, "Goal II: Provide forest based recreational opportunities" states, "Continue to provide primitive outdoor recreation opportunities, which include hunting, hiking, horseback riding, picnicking and primitive camping on State Forests." Based on this plan, as well as traditional use of state forests by the public for outdoor recreation activities, and the presence of developed recreational facilities on state forests, such as campgrounds, picnic areas, trails, and fishing access, Morgan-Monroe State Forest is clearly a "publicly-owned recreation area" envisioned by Section 4(f).

According to Section 5.22.3.5 of the DEIS, Section 5 of I-69 will require acquisition of .07 to 7.64 acres of Morgan-Monroe State Forest for right-of-way (page 5.22-6). This qualifies as a permanent use, as well as a constructive use, of a Section 4(f) property. Therefore INDOT should prepare an individual Section 4(f) evaluation for the use of Morgan-Monroe State Forest land.

Response:

The IDNR plan cited is not specific to the Morgan-Monroe State Forest property. When applying Section 4(f) to multiple-use public land holdings (e.g., National Forests, State Forests, Bureau of Land Management lands), FHWA must comply with 23 CFR 774.11(d). Section 4(f) applies only to those portions of a multiple-use public property that are designated by statute or identified in an official management plan of the administering agency as being primarily for public park, recreation, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge purposes, and are determined to be significant for such purposes. (FHWA, Section 4(f) Policy Paper, July 20, 2012, Question 4). Section 4(f) does not apply to the portion of the Morgan-Monroe State Forest impacted by the project. Please also see comment AS002-01 received from the property manager (the official with jurisdiction) who does



not raise any such objection in regards to the DEIS findings relevant to the Morgan-Monroe State Forest Section 4(f) applicability.

PO018-22 Comment:

Conclusion

Because of the I-69 highway's significant environmental impact, high cost, and questionable benefits, Section 5 as well as the remaining Alternative 3C route for the new-terrain I-69 should be reevaluated, and instead INDOT should pursue the U.S. 41/I-70 route alternative.

Response:

Please refer to PO006-01 response.

**PO019-01 12/06/2012 Verbal (Public Hearing)
Thomas Tokarski, Citizens for Appropriate Rural Roads**

Comment:

It's time for a time-out on I-69. Many things have changed since this highway was proposed 22 years ago. We live in very different circumstances. Indiana cannot maintain the roads and bridges it already has. Highway funding sources are in decline and expected to stay down. Hundreds of millions of tax dollars have been spent on studies with predetermined outcomes and whose results are not credible. Extortion was used to force communities to bend to INDOT's will. Shoddy construction, lower standards and failure to follow rules and regulations are rampant. Governor Daniels instructed INDOT to throw out the rule book when it came to building I-69, and that is what is happening.

Meanwhile, state and federal oversight agencies are unwilling or unable to regulate I-69 construction due to political pressure.

Response:

Regarding funding, see refer to PO018-16 response.

Sections 1 through 3 of the I-69 project are completed and open to traffic. Section 4 is under construction, and is scheduled for completion in 2014. The designs for these first four sections, as well as Section 5, satisfy the requirements of the Indiana Design Manual.

State and federal agencies have fully participated in each Tier 2 NEPA study, as well as in post-NEPA permitting and monitoring. This project has followed the FHWA-INDOT Streamlined Environmental Impact Statement Procedures (September 2007). These Procedures include formal meetings and coordination at two milestones (Purpose and Need/Preliminary Alternatives and Screening of Alternatives). Agencies have been



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 5—Final Environmental Impact Statement

provided the opportunity to comment on the Section 5 DEIS, and their comments (and FHWA's/INDOT's responses) are documented in Volume III of this FEIS. Finally, local governments have had regular, formal meetings with FHWA and INDOT as part of the formal Participating Agency process for this project; see Appendix B in this FEIS, Participating Agency Meeting Summaries, for documentation of this process.

PO019-02 Comment:

Climate change is real. 2012 is among the warmest years on record. Hundreds of billions of dollars in damages have occurred due to frequent and violent storms, droughts and floods. As I-69 encourages more traffic, it contributes significant carbon emissions and exacerbates climate change. Clear-cutting forest is exactly the wrong thing to do when the loss of forests worldwide is a major problem contributing to climate change and loss of species.

Response:

Please refer to AF002-28 response. Since this project utilizes an existing alignment, impacts to forests were minimized to the extent practical. The project does not include clear-cutting of forests.

PO019-03 Comment:

It is clear that there is not enough money to finish this highway. As a result, the economic models used to predict growth of jobs and growth fail. The presumed economic benefits, which were never very significant, will be much, much less.

Response:

The premise of this comment (that lack of funding will prevent the I-69 project from being completed) is not valid. Please refer to PO018-16 regarding the commitment for funding of the I-69 project. The economic forecasting models referenced were used in the Tier 1 study, and represented the state of the practice in economic forecasting. No further response regarding this Tier 1 analysis is provided in this Tier 2 study.

PO019-04 Comment:

On the other hand, air, water, light, and noise pollution will increase. Congestion will increase. Our highways will become more dangerous with more accidents and fatalities.

Response:

Section 7.3, *Section 5 Mitigation Measures and Commitments*, identifies measures to control and/or mitigate air, water, light, and noise pollution. Congestion and safety are improved with the construction of I-69 Section 5 (see Section 3.3.1, *Transportation Performance Indicators*).



PO019-05 Comment:

And finally, an unprecedented number of citizens have spoken out against this highway in a democracy. That should mean something. It is never too late to stop doing the wrong thing. Let's call a time-out and reconsider this entire project in light of today's circumstances, not the situation as it was in the 1950s. Much has been lost. There is still much to say.

Response:

Comment noted.