

CAC Meeting #3

Meeting Information Packet

July 25, 2002

Klondike Middle School

Art Room

6 - 8:30 p.m.



US 231 Relocation Study
SR 26 to US 52
Tippecanoe County, IN
INDOT Des. No. 9802890

To: CAC Members
From: US 231 Relocation Study Team
Subject: Meeting Packet for CAC Meeting #3 – 07/25/02 - Klondike Middle School

Enclosed is a variety of materials to assist you in preparing for the upcoming CAC meeting on July 25, 2002. Most of these materials are provided as background information to bring everyone up-to-date on the development of the study and preliminary alternative analysis. The study continues to make progress. To date, we have conducted two public information meetings and three Community Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings. The feedback received on the study has been excellent. As a result of the May 16, 2002 CAC meeting and the June 6, 2002 Public Information Meeting, some changes have been implemented on the project.

- Build Alternative alignments Line 4 and Line 10 have been adjusted to create a new terminus at US 52. Line 4 was adjusted to allow this alignment to be more viable for consideration in the preliminary alternative analysis; Line 4 and Line 10 are iterations of each other. See Figure 1 Attached.
- At this time, Build Alternative alignments Line 1, 4, 7, 9, and 10 will be carried forward for detailed study in the environmental document. In other words, these Build Alternative alignments will be studied further for environmental impacts (wetlands, displacements, noise, etc.). The purpose of the study is to identify a preferred alternative for the US 231 Relocation Study from SR 26 and US 52, based on new information gathered and reviewed since the 1992 ROD.
- We have created a list of "Frequently Asked Questions" (FAQ's) based on the feedback we have received. These FAQ's are included in this packet and will be posted to the project website.
- As per the CAC Meeting conducted on May 16, 2002, Community Impact Assessment (CIA) "homework" is provided to the CAC in this packet to better understand impacts that may result from the Build Alternative alignments carried forward (Lines 1, 4, 7, 9, and 10).

To assist with the detailed study of alternatives, we seek input on certain types of community impacts from the CAC members. Specifically, we would like input on the types of impacts that can best be understood by people who live in the area. At the upcoming meeting, we will ask for responses to a series of questions and we will complete an exercise that examines certain types of impacts on each neighborhood for each Build Alternative alignment. We have enclosed the questions and worksheets so that you can be familiar with these materials and have time to think about them. There are also two things we would like you to do before the meeting if you are able:

1. Looking at the list of neighborhoods in the study area, and to the extent that you are familiar with the features of each neighborhood, please make a short list of the features that differentiate each neighborhood. Are there any unique features? Why would you decide to live in one neighborhood versus another? It's fine if you can only complete this for a small number of neighborhoods.
2. For the matrix of neighborhood impacts, please fill in the column(s) that pertain(s) to your neighborhood and bring the form to the meeting. This will ensure that each member submits information on his/her neighborhood. At the CAC meeting, each small group will work on one Build Alternative alignment and some members therefore may not be identifying their own neighborhood impacts.

We appreciate the time you spend to prepare for this meeting and hope you find it helpful to have the materials in advance. We look forward to seeing you on Thursday, July 25, 2002. Please RSVP by July 22nd (if you haven't already done so) via email to jriddle@mbakercorp.com or via telephone to Kurt Weiss at the phone number listed below. If you will be unable to attend, please send any completed materials from this packet to the meeting via another member, or mail or fax them by July 25th to:

Kurt Weiss
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
701 East 83rd Avenue
Merrillville, IN 46410
Fax: 219-755-0233

Lastly, I'd like to reiterate the role of the CAC which is to obtain feedback on the project to share with other members of the community and to provide information to the project team regarding the community. The CAC will not be asked to reach consensus for a preferred alternative; Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) will continue to be the decisions makers. We hope CAC members understand this CIA approach is new in Indiana and that this project is a test case. Your participation is vital and very much appreciated.

We look forward to seeing you on July 25, 2002.

Sincerely,

Wendy L. Vachet
Project Manager
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL INFORMATION FOR CAC MEETING # 3 PACKET:	4
I. PURPOSE AND NEED.....	4
A. The Proposed Action.....	4
B. Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action	4
1) Conformity to existing transportation plan(s):.....	5
2) Existing traffic and accident characteristics:	6
3) Future land use developments:.....	7
4) Future traffic assignments:.....	7
II. ALTERNATIVES REDUCTION ANALYSIS	8
A. Alternatives Reduction Analysis/Screening Process	8
1) Purpose and Need Requirements	9
2) Section 4(f) and 6(f) Resource Impacts:	10
B. Alternatives Eliminated from Detailed Study.....	11
C. Summary	12
III. TRAFFIC REPORT SYNOPSIS	12
COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (CIA) EXERCISE	17
COMMUNITY IMPACT ANALYSIS.....	21

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1 Future and Existing Landuse
Figure 2 Preliminary Community Access

FEQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (FAQs)

General Information for CAC Meeting # 3 Packet:

Following are consolidated summaries of three of the components of the US 231 Relocation Study: Purpose and Need, preliminary Alternative Reduction Analysis, and the Traffic Report. These summaries are intended to provide a reasonable degree of understanding of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process as it pertains specifically to this project. It is essential to keep in mind that all of the information provided below is preliminary in nature, and that no final decisions have been made regarding any of the alignments or recommendations discussed. Furthermore, this summary does not discuss the detailed environmental studies that have yet to be documented for the alignments recommended to be carried forward.

The US 231 Relocation Study incorporates by reference the 1987 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), 1992 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and subsequent 1992 Record Of Decision (ROD) for the Proposed Relocation of US 231 and Wabash River Crossing, Tippecanoe County, Indiana. The focus of the US 231 Relocation study is to reevaluate alternatives for the US 231 Relocation Study from State Road 26 to US 52 - thus completing the original project.

The reader should refer to the previous DEIS, FEIS, ROD, and other documents identified in the following text for information regarding the project that is not presented in detail in this packet. These documents are available on the project website (www.relocate231.com/project.htm#docs) and at the project repository located at the Area Plan Commission of Tippecanoe County (TCAPC) Office, 20 W. 3rd Street, Lafayette, Indiana.

I. PURPOSE AND NEED

A. The Proposed Action

The proposed action is to complete the original Proposed Relocation of US 231 and Wabash River Crossing project in Tippecanoe County, Indiana. The original preferred alternative was approved in the ROD. The southern portion of the project, including a new Wabash River crossing and improvements to South River Road, has been constructed. The portion of the project from South River Road to State Road (SR) 26 is currently undergoing final engineering design. The purpose of this study is to reevaluate alternatives for the northern portion of the original project from SR 26 to US 52 and, if necessary, develop and evaluate new alternatives that meet the purpose and need of the proposed action and select a final preferred alternative that fulfills the purpose and need of the overall project as approved by the ROD.

B. Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action

The purpose and need for the US 231 Relocation Study was established in the 1987 DEIS and 1992 FEIS. The subsequent ROD approved the preferred alternative of Line A from south of CR 500S to Harrison Bridge, and Line 1 from South River Road to US 52.

Four elements of purpose and need were identified in the DEIS and remain valid. These elements are briefly discussed below:

1) Conformity to existing transportation plan(s):

- a. The US 231 corridor is identified as a study corridor in the **INDOT Draft 2000-2025 Long-Range Plan (INDOT LRP)**, updated in 2001. The INDOT LRP dedicates funds in the years 2000 to 2004 to construct US 231 as a four-lane facility from 0.5 miles north of the Wabash River to SR 26. Assuming the planning process has been completed and an acceptable alternative has been identified, the construction of US 231 between SR 26 and US 52 will be funded in the years 2004 to 2009.
- b. An alignment between SR 26 and US 52 to be completed by 2010 is included in the **2025 Transportation Plan**, which is an amendment to the Transportation Element of Tippecanoe Comprehensive Plan, adopted by the TPAPC in 1981.
 - i. The 2025 Transportation Plan identifies a preferred alignment- this alignment is Build Alternative alignment Line 7 of the alignments considered in the US 231 Relocation Study.
 - Build Alternative alignment Line 7 proceeds north from its intersection at South River Road, around the Purdue University Airport to the east, and then heads west where it will cross SR 26 just east of the SR 26/Newman Road intersection. From there, the road will go north where it ties in with McCormick Road north of the McCormick/Lindberg Road intersection. McCormick Road will be improved to four lanes up to its terminus at US 52.
 - ii. The 2025 Transportation Plan also identifies three roadways within the study area that are planned to be extended westward to meet or cross relocated US 231.
 - Cumberland Avenue is to be extended from US 52 to CR 300W (Klondike Road) as a two-lane roadway;
 - SR 126 (Cherry Lane) is planned to be extended to relocated US 231 and; and
 - Intramural Drive is to be extended southward to the portion of relocated US 231, currently under design, that is adjacent to the Purdue University Airport.
- c. The **September 2001 Purdue University Transportation and Parking Plan (Purdue Transportation Plan)** assumes completion of the northern section (SR 26 to US 52) of the Proposed Relocation of US 231 project, including the extensions of Cherry Lane west and Intramural Drive south to the relocated US 231.
 - i. According to the plan, relocated US 231 will provide highway access to the west side of the campus and will divert traffic traveling through West Lafayette from sections of the perimeter roadway, particularly Northwestern Avenue.

- ii. Reduced non-campus traffic on the perimeter roadway will increase the safety for pedestrians and bicyclists around the campus.
- d. **A reciprocal agreement** was reached on March 20, 1997 between INDOT, Tippecanoe County, the City of Lafayette, and the City of West Lafayette. The agreement states that with the relocation of US 231, it is no longer appropriate or convenient to route state traffic along several existing state routes.
 - i. The state would revert jurisdiction over to local jurisdictions, and the function of the routes would be limited to local traffic circulation.
 - ii. The local jurisdictions would be responsible for all future maintenance, reconstruction, and construction on these routes.

2) **Existing traffic and accident characteristics:**

Detailed traffic analysis information will be provided in the Traffic Report as an appendix to the Engineering Design Study Report. According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials guidelines (*A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*, 2001) the desirable level of service (LOS) for urban/suburban highways is LOS C or better. Several links along US 52, US 231 (Northwestern Avenue), River Road, and across the Harrison Bridge operate at a LOS D or LOS E, which represent unacceptable levels of congestion.

Safety

Historical accident data at intersections within or adjacent to the study area were compiled for years 1997 to 1999 from the TCAPC 1999 *Vehicle Crash Study Report* and accident databases.

- Five intersections along (current) US 231 experienced ten or more accidents per year.
- Two additional intersections potentially affected by cut-through traffic on the west side of US 231 also experienced ten or more accidents per year.

The accident rate per million entering vehicles (MEV) was calculated for each intersection.

- In 1999, three intersections had an accident rate over two accidents per MEV, which is the threshold at which the Institute of Transportation Engineers recommends that improvements be evaluated for intersections.
- Three intersections: Stadium Avenue/US 231 (Northwestern Avenue), Stadium Avenue/University Drive, and SR 26 (State Street)/Grant Road are ranked between number 1 and number 16 for the highest accident rate intersections in the TCAPC 1999 Vehicle Crash Study Report.

Assuming that the accident rate at a particular intersection remains constant, the number of accidents at that intersection will decrease if the number of vehicles entering the intersection decreases. Relocation of US 231 will remove through traffic and some Purdue University destined traffic from Northwestern Avenue (US 231), thus reducing the potential for accidents at the intersections along Northwestern Avenue due to decreased entering volumes.

3) **Future land use developments:**

- a. The **Tippecanoe Comprehensive Plan** divides Tippecanoe County into three categories for land use planning: urban, urbanizing, and rural. All of West Lafayette is considered urban. Wabash Township is considered urbanizing, and Shelby Township is considered rural. The plan notes that urbanizing and rural areas are pressured to become more urban, often conflicting with agricultural activities.
- b. ***Focus on the Future of Unincorporated Wabash Township, an Action Plan (Focus on the Future Plan)*** was developed in 1996 during a series of meetings with Wabash Township residents to identify the township's strengths and weaknesses and determine community goals. The fundamental land use goal identified in the plan is preserving the rural character of the area by preserving prime farmland and encouraging low-density development. This plan further recognizes the need for the continuation of US 231 to address traffic congestion at the intersection of State Street, River Road (SR 43), and Harrison Bridge.

4) **Future traffic assignments:**

Updated localized traffic analysis indicates that there continues to be a need to attract additional projected traffic volumes from existing roadways, particularly those roadways east of the Kankakee, Beaverville and Southern Railroad (KBS Railroad) where projected volumes increase and capacity is a concern.

Thirty representative traffic links were selected along existing roadways to use to illustrate the traffic modeling results. These links are representative of critical roadway segments frequently traveled in the study area.

- Generally, existing roadways located west of the KBS Railroad will experience an increase in traffic volumes; however, these roadways will be able to absorb the additional capacity.
- Existing roadways to the east of the KBS Railroad will also experience an increase in traffic volumes, and several of these roadways will exceed capacity which in turn may increase the likelihood of traffic or pedestrian related accidents.

Representative links to the east of the KBS Railroad, where the concentration of existing roadways that will experience the greatest increase in volume, are considered the most critical for localized traffic concerns.

II. ALTERNATIVES REDUCTION ANALYSIS

The following text summarizes the alternatives considered for the completion of the original Proposed Relocation of US 231 between SR 26 and US 52 in Tippecanoe County, Indiana and identifies those alternatives carried forward for additional detailed study.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) have evaluated a range of alternatives for the portion of the Proposed Relocation of US 231 between SR 26 and US 52.

This range includes the No-Build Alternative, and a Build Alternative featuring three alignments previously considered and seven newly developed alignments. The No-Build Alternative for 2025 includes all of the projects within Tippecanoe County's 2025 Transportation Plan, with the exception of the north section of US 231 from SR 26 to US 52. The No-Build Alternative also includes the section of US 231 between South River Road and SR 26 that is under final design.

Funds for this section of US 231 are programmed by INDOT; therefore, it is included as part of the No-Build Alternative.

Three major conditions controlled the location of additional alignments developed:

- Avoidance or minimization, where practicable, of adverse effects to environmental resources as provided by the environmental constraint mapping; particularly residential displacements and sensitive resources such as Celery Bog,
- Avoidance or minimization, where practicable, of potential Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) resources, and
- Provision for functional access and consideration of access from existing collector roads (e.g. SR 26, Lindberg Road, US 52) to the main line of an alignment.

A. Alternatives Reduction Analysis/Screening Process

The No-build Alternative and the Build Alternative alignment Line 1 were automatically carried forward for detailed study, without regard to the screening criteria.

- Although the No-Build Alternative was dismissed in previous studies as not meeting the purpose and need of the project, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations governing all federal agencies specifically require analysis of a No Action (i.e., No-Build) Alternative. Therefore, while the No-Build Alternative does not achieve the purpose and need for the project, it has been defined and carried forward for comparison purposes with the Build Alternative.
- Line 1 was carried forward as a basis for comparison because it is the original Preferred Alternative in the ROD.

The Alternatives Considered were evaluated by a screening process to determine whether they warranted additional detailed study. The elimination of alternatives from

detailed study is consistent with FHWA regulations (23 CFR §771.123). A consistent set of screening criteria was applied to all of the alternatives under consideration. If an alternative does not meet purpose and need, or if it has potential impacts to Section 4(f) or Section 6(f) resources, it is not considered for further study.

1) Purpose and Need Requirements

A screening criterion was developed for each element to determine whether the alternative meets the purpose and need for the project.

The criteria are as follows:

- a. **Consistency with local plans:** Each alternative was evaluated to determine if it is consistent with four local transportation and land use plans.

INDOT LRP: An alternative was considered consistent with the INDOT LRP if it is a limited access roadway and begins at SR 26 and ends at US 52.

2025 Transportation Plan: An alternative was considered consistent with the 2025 Transportation Plan if it includes relocating US 231 from Northwestern Avenue and allows for the completion of other planned roadways within the study area. These roadways included the Cumberland Avenue Extension and the Cherry Lane Extension (see Chapter 1, Section 1.3.4 for description of additional improvements)

Purdue Transportation Plan: An alternative was considered consistent with the Purdue Transportation Plan if it does not significantly disrupt the land use plans of Purdue University and allows for the extension of campus access roads to relocated US 231 (such as Cherry Lane).

Land Use Plans: An alternative was considered consistent with the Tippecanoe Comprehensive Plan and Wabash Township Focus on the Future Plan if it does not encourage development outside of the urbanized or urbanizing areas (i.e., Shelby Township) or provide new access and/or higher traffic levels to the large tracts of farmland in western Wabash Township.

- b. **Accommodate existing and projected traffic volumes and address safety concerns:** A Build Alternative alignment was considered to meet purpose and need elements concerning traffic and safety if both the northern or southern half of the US 231 (divided by CR 200N):

- are projected to carry at least 10,000 AADT, and
- to carry no less than 50 percent of the traffic volume of the highest overall volume alignment (Line 7).

The traffic analysis indicates that traffic that is carried by each alignment is predominately traffic that is removed from congested roadways in the study area such as existing US 231, McCormick Road, and CR 300W (Klondike

Road). Removing traffic volumes from the existing roadways will potentially reduce the number of accidents at intersections along these routes.

Year 2025 forecast average annual daily traffic (AADT) for each alignment was obtained from the TCAPC forecasting model. Traffic volumes are shown for the section of US 231 south of CR 200N and the section north of CR 200N because there was a distinct change in volume at this location for many of the alignments. Line 7 is projected to carry the highest overall traffic volume (17,700 AADT and 19,300 AADT on the northern and southern sections respectively).

2) Section 4(f) and 6(f) Resource Impacts:

Each alternative was evaluated to determine whether there was potential involvement with Section 4(f) and/or Section 6(f)-protected resources within the study area. Section 4(f) protected resources include public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites. While impacts on Section 4(f)-protected properties would not automatically remove an alignment from consideration, they would be considered significant drawbacks because Section 4(f) requires the avoidance of all Section 4(f)-protected properties, as long as there is a prudent and feasible alternative available that avoids those resources.

As shown in the following table, any alternative that does not meet the objectives of Screening 1 has been eliminated from detailed study (except the No-Build alternative and Line 1).

Screening 1

Screening Criteria	No-Build Alternative	Build Alternative Alignments									
		Line 1 (Original Preferred Alternative)	Line 2	Line 3	Line 4	Line 5	Line 6	Line 7	Line 8	Line 9	Line 10
Purpose and Need Requirements:											
1. Consistency with Local Plans											
INDOT LRP	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2025 Trans. Plan	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Purdue Trans. Plan	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Land Use Plans ²	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
2. Accommodate existing and projected traffic volumes and address safety concerns											
Carries at least 10,000 AADT on both sections	No	No	N/A	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Carries at least 50% of the AADT of the highest vol. alignment (Line 7)	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
"Fatal Flaws"											
Potential involvement with known or potential Section 4(f) resources?	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Carried forward for detailed study?	Yes ¹	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

¹To be carried forward (per CEQ regulations)

²Land Use plans include the Tippecanoe Comprehensive Plan, the Wabash Township Focus on the Future plan, and the Purdue Transportation Plan.

The alignments that have been eliminated from detailed study are shaded.

B. Alternatives Eliminated from Detailed Study

The following discussion of each alignment eliminated explains how the alignment failed to meet project purpose and need. If the alignment did meet project purpose and need, the discussion explains how the alignment failed the screening due to potential involvement with a Section 4(f) and/or Section 6(f) resource.

Line 2: Line 2 was considered and dismissed in the prior DEIS and FEIS based on residential displacements and wetland impacts. Although Line 2 meets the overall purpose and need for the project, it directly impacts Celery Bog - a Section 4(f) and 6(f) resource; therefore, Line 2 was eliminated from further consideration or detailed study.

Line 3 : Line 3 was considered and dismissed in the DEIS and FEIS based on residential displacements, concerns regarding impacts to Klondike Elementary and Middle School, and lack of community support. Although Line 3 meets the overall purpose and need for the project, it presents potential impacts to Klondike Elementary and Middle Schools, which are considered Section 4(f) resources; therefore, Line 3 was eliminated from further consideration or detailed study.

Line 5: Line 5 was developed as an improved roadway alignment to be considered in the environmental document. Line 5 does not meet the traffic element of purpose and need because it is projected at less than 10,000 AADT, and would carry less than 50 percent of the traffic volume of the highest overall volume alignment (Line 7), on the northern half of the roadway. In addition, Line 5 is inconsistent with the 2025 Transportation Plan and the Purdue Transportation Plan because it does not allow for extensions to connect with Cumberland Avenue or Cherry Lane. Line 5 is also inconsistent with the Tippecanoe Comprehensive Plan goal of maintaining the rural character of the areas west of CR 500W in Shelby Township. Finally, Line 5 is inconsistent with future land use goals contained in the Focus on the Future Plan, which call for preservation of the rural character of the area by preserving farmland and encouraging low-density development. Thus, Line 5 does not adequately meet the purpose and need for the proposed action and was eliminated from further consideration or detailed study.

Line 6: Line 6 was developed as an alignment to be considered in the environmental document. Line 6 is the western-most alignment considered, with a US 52 tie-in near Montmorenci. Line 6 does not meet the traffic element of purpose and need because it is projected at less than 10,000 AADT, and would carry less than 50 percent of the traffic volume of the highest volume alignment (Line 7), on the northern half of the roadway. In addition, Line 6 is inconsistent with the 2025 Transportation Plan and the Purdue Transportation Plan because it does not allow for extensions to connect with Cumberland Avenue or Cherry Lane. Line 6 also is inconsistent with the Tippecanoe Comprehensive Plan goal of maintaining the rural character of the areas west of CR 500W. Finally, Line 6 is inconsistent with future land use goals contained in the Focus on the Future Plan, which call for preservation of the rural character of the area by preserving farmland and encouraging low-density development. Thus, Line 6 does not

adequately meet the purpose and need for the proposed action and was eliminated from further consideration or detailed study.

Line 8: Line 8 was developed as an alignment to be considered in the environmental document. Line 8 does not meet the traffic element of Purpose and Need because it is projected at less than 10,000 AADT, and would carry less than 50 percent of the traffic volume of the highest volume alignment (Line 7), on the northern half of the roadway. In addition, Line 8 is inconsistent with the 2025 Transportation Plan and the Purdue Transportation Plan because it does not allow for extensions to connect with Cumberland Avenue or Cherry Lane. Line 8 also is inconsistent with future land use goals contained in the Focus on the Future Plan, which call for preservation of the rural character of the area by preserving farmland and encouraging low-density development. Thus, Line 8 does not adequately meet the purpose and need for the proposed action and was eliminated from further consideration or detailed study.

C. Summary

To summarize, Build Alternative alignment Lines 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8, have been considered and eliminated from further consideration or detailed study. These alignments lack consistency with local transportation and land use plans or, as is the case with Lines 2 and 3, result in "fatal flaw" impacts to Section 4(f) resources.

III. TRAFFIC REPORT SYNOPSIS

The purpose of the traffic study report is to document the traffic analysis performed for the Environmental Document. The traffic study report discusses the existing and future traffic conditions within the project study area (study area), providing the basis for updating traffic data contained in the DEIS's purpose and need. Traffic volumes, level of service, and accident frequency are measures used to establish a portion of the project's purpose and need. The report also describes the No-Build Alternative and Build Alternative alignments, and provides a comparison between them with regard to traffic issues.

The traffic analysis area is much larger than the study area because vehicles that influence the traffic conditions in the study area often have origins or destinations outside of the study area. In addition, existing and planned transportation facilities outside of the study area can divert or feed traffic into the study area. Portions of existing US 231 affected by the proposed project are outside the study area, but still should be included in the traffic analysis. As the regional traffic forecasting model and regional origin and destination data are used in the traffic analysis the traffic analysis area is essentially the whole county. However, traffic data and conditions are analyzed in detail and presented in this report only for roadway segments within the study area or immediately adjacent to the study area.

The traffic analysis used for this study relies on output from the regional traffic forecasting model. The model, developed using the modeling software TranPlan, is operated and maintained by the Area Plan Commission of Tippecanoe County (TCAPC). The model is the principal tool used by the TCAPC to develop the long-range transportation plan. The base year for the model is 1999. The design year for this study is 2025. The model was calibrated using existing 1999 traffic counts. Future land use and socioeconomic data are based on the adopted Comprehensive Plan for Tippecanoe County.

Four kinds of socioeconomic data are used as input for the model: number of persons, number of households, number of vehicles per household available, and number of jobs.

A total of 32 roadway links within the traffic analysis area were chosen for comparing the Build Alternatives and No-Build Alternative. Of these, 27 comprise existing roadway segments and the other five are roadway links that reflect the No-Build and Build Alternative alignments. Links were chosen that that would be representative of traffic conditions within the study area and whose traffic conditions might be affected by the Build Alternative. Capacity analyses were completed for the chosen roadway links for the 1999, 2025 No-Build Alternative, and nine of ten 2025 potential Build Alternative alignments developed by this study.

The capacity analyses were performed using procedures from the *2000 Highway Capacity Manual* (2000 HCM) and the 2000 McTrans Highway Capacity Software. The key output from the capacity analyses is level of service of a roadway segment. Level of service (LOS) is a qualitative measure of the operating conditions of a traffic stream on a transportation facility. There are six LOS (LOS A through LOS F) defined for each type of facility. LOS A represents the best operating conditions with no congestion and LOS F the worst with heavy congestion. The links selected for the capacity analyses fall within three categories: multi-lane divided highways, urban arterials, and rural county roads.

Existing traffic counts for 1999 were obtained from INDOT and the TCAPC. The volumes provided account for seasonal variations and represent the Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT). Analysis of 24-hour traffic counts on a dozen links within the study area indicated that the percentage of daily traffic occurring during the peak hour ranged from 8-11 percent. For analysis purposes, 10 percent was used to estimate peak hour volumes from AADTs. The traffic counts also showed that trucks make up approximately four percent of the overall traffic.

The No-Build Alternative for 2025 includes all of the projects within the 2025 Transportation Plan with the exception of the improvements on US 231 between SR 26 and I-65 and the extension of Cherry Lane to relocated US 231. The No-Build Alternative also includes the section of US 231 between South River Road and SR 26 that is under final engineering design. Funds for this section of US 231 are programmed by INDOT. The probability is extremely high that this section will be constructed; therefore, it is included as part of the No-Build Alternative. Other improvements to the roadway network since 1999 within the study area include:

- Widening of River Road from US 231 to SR 26 to 4 lanes
- Widening SR 26 between New US 231 and McCormick Road to 4 lanes
- Widening CR 200N (Lindberg Road) between CR 300W (Klondike Road) and McCormick Road to 4 lanes
- Extending Cumberland Avenue to CR 300W (Klondike Road)

Analysis of the No-Build Alternative indicates that there continues to be a need to attract additional projected traffic volumes from existing roadways, particularly those roadways east of the KBS Railroad tracks where projected volumes increase and capacity is a concern. Generally, existing roadways located west of the KBS Railroad will experience

an increase in traffic volumes; however, these roadways will be able to absorb the additional capacity. Existing roadways to the east of the KBS Railroad will also experience an increase in traffic volumes, and several of these roadways will exceed capacity which in turn may increase the likelihood of traffic or pedestrian related accidents. Representative links to the east of the KBS Railroad, where the concentration of existing roadways that will experience increased volumes is greatest, are considered the most critical for localized traffic concerns.

The Build Alternative consists of constructing a four-lane divided urban/rural arterial street with four-foot inside shoulders and 10-foot outside shoulders. The directions of travel are separated by either a depressed grass median or concrete median barrier. Limited access is provided with at-grade intersections at only major state and county roads.

Ten alignments were considered for the Build Alternative. Seven of the alignments are new facilities along new alignments. The remaining three alignments use existing roadways for over half of the project length. Preliminary access provided to/from US 231 for each alignment is summarized in the table below.

Preliminary Access Points Provided Under Each Alignment

Build Alternative Alignment/ Line	Preliminary Access Points
1	SR 26 SR 126 (Cherry Lane extension) CR 200 N (Lindberg) US 52
2	To be eliminated because of impact on Celery Bog and a high number of displacements.
3	SR 26 SR 126 (Cherry Lane extension) CR 200 N (Lindberg) Cumberland Extension US 52
4	SR 26 SR 126 (Cherry Lane extension) CR 200 N (Lindberg) – Dogleg connection CR 475 W US 52
5	1) Frontage roads the length of the roadway with several access point locations or 2) SR 26 CR250 W Entrance to Appleridge at the Orchards Entrance to Deer Ridge CR 300W CR 400W – Dogleg connection CR 475W US 52
6	SR 26 CR 250 W CR 350 W CR 200 N (Lindberg) Jackson Highway US 52 US 231

Build Alternative Alignment/ Line	Preliminary Access Points
7	SR 26 SR 126 (Cherry Lane extension) CR 200 N (Lindberg) Cumberland Extension Frontage Road US 52
8	SR 26 CR 250 W CR 300 W (Klondike) Entrance to Appleridge at the Orchards Entrance to Deer Ridge CR 200 N (Lindberg) CR 250 N US 52
9	SR 26 SR 126 (Cherry Lane extension) CR 200 N (Lindberg) Cumberland Extension Frontage Road US 52
10	SR 26 SR 126 (Cherry Lane extension) CR 200 N (Lindberg) – Dogleg connection CR 300 W (Klondike) – Dogleg connection US 52

Source: Michael Baker Jr., Inc., 2002

The Build Alternative alignments were evaluated on three traffic related measures:

- amount of traffic volume carried by each alignment
- improvements to level of service of roadways in the traffic analysis area over the No-Build Alternative
- reduction in traffic volumes on congested roadways for those roadways operating at LOS D or worse in the future No-Build condition.

Year 2025 forecast AADT for each alignment was obtained from the TCAPC forecasting model. Traffic volumes are shown for the section of US 231 south of CR 200N and the section north of CR 200N because there was a distinct change in volume at this location for many of the alignments. Line 7 is projected to carry the highest overall traffic volume (17,700 AADT and 19,300 AADT on the northern and southern sections respectively). Lines 1, 5, 6, and 8 are projected to carry 50 percent less traffic on at least one of the segments of US 231 than Line 7. Therefore, Lines 1, 5, 6, and 8 do not appear to be as highly desired as travel routes when compared to some of the other alignments. In addition Lines 1, 5, 6, and 8 carry less than 10,000 AADT for either the northern or southern segment. Less than 10,000 AADT does not justify a four-lane divided highway.

Analysis of the No-Build Alternative indicates that the need to attract additional projected traffic volumes from existing roadways will continue in the future. Particularly for the roadways east of the KBS Railroad tracks where volumes are projected to increase and capacity limitations exist. Generally, existing roadways located west of the

KBS Railroad will experience an increase in traffic volumes; however, these roadways will be able to absorb the additional capacity. Existing roadways to the east of the KBS Railroad will also experience an increase in traffic volumes. Several of these roadways will exceed capacity, which in turn may increase the likelihood of traffic or pedestrian related accidents. Roadway links to the east of the KBS Railroad represent a concentration of roadways which will experience the highest projected increase in volumes and are considered the most critical for localized traffic concerns.

The traffic analysis indicates that the traffic carried by each alignment is predominately traffic that is diverted from congested roadways in the study area, such as existing US 231, McCormick Road, and CR 300W (Klondike Road). Removing traffic volumes from the existing roadways will potentially reduce the number of accidents at intersections along these routes; thus improving safety.

The traffic analysis shows that Line 7 is projected to carry the highest overall traffic volume (17,700 AADT to 19,300 AADT). Lines 1, 5, 6, and 8 are projected to carry 50 percent less traffic than Line 7 on either the northern or southern segment of US 231. Therefore, Lines 1, 5, 6, and 8 do not appear to be as attractive as travel routes when compared to the other alignments. A volume of at least 10,000 AADT is required to justify a four-lane divided highway. Lines 1, 5, 6, and 8 are projected to carry less than 10,000 AADT on either the northern or southern segment of US 231. Alignments 1, 3, 5, and 8 have less of an impact on reducing traffic volumes on congested roadway links within the study area than the other alignments.

From the analysis, it appears that Lines 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 do not address the traffic congestion and safety concerns in the study area as well as the remaining four alignments (Lines 4, 7, 9, and 10). Therefore, they do not meet the aspects of project purpose and need related to existing traffic and accident characteristics and future traffic assignments. Of the remaining four alignments (4, 7, 9, and 10) none appear to be superior to the other three with regard to improving traffic operating conditions within the study area. Line 7 carries the most traffic, Line 9 has the highest number of LOS improvements (five) of the selected key roadway links, and Line 10 is slightly better in reducing congestion on congested key roadway links. Environmental impacts associated with the Build Alternative alignments carried forward for detailed study will be addressed in the Environmental Document.

Community Impact Assessment (CIA) Exercise

To assist with the detailed study of alternatives, we seek input on certain types of community impacts from the CAC members. Specifically, we would like input on the types of impacts that can best be understood by people who live in the area. At the upcoming meeting, we will ask for responses to a series of questions, and we will complete an exercise that examines certain types of impacts on each neighborhood for each alignment. We have enclosed the questions and worksheets so that you can be familiar with these materials and have time to think about them. Figure 2 is attached to assist you with reviewing and performing the CIA exercise.

There are also two things we would like you to do before the meeting if you are able:

1. Looking at the list of neighborhoods in the study area, and to the extent that you are familiar with the features of any neighborhood, please make a short list of the features that differentiate each neighborhood. Are there any unique features? Why would you decide to live in one neighborhood versus another? It is fine if you can only complete this for a small number of neighborhoods.
2. For the matrix of neighborhood impacts, please fill in the column(s) that pertain(s) to your neighborhood and bring the form to the meeting. This will ensure that each member submits information on his/her neighborhood. At the CAC meeting, each small group will work on one alignment and some members therefore may not be identifying their own neighborhood impacts.

We appreciate the time you spend to prepare for this meeting, and hope you find it helpful to have the materials in advance.

Neighborhood Descriptions

Blackbird Farms

The Lodge

McCormick Place Apartments

Appleridge at the Orchard

Neighborhood south of US 52 on Kerfoot Dr

Blackthorne

Brindon Woods

Carrington Estates

Copper Beech Townhomes

Green Meadows

Huntington

Lindberg Village

McQuinn Estates

Pemberly Court

Pine Meadows

Pine View

Pointe West Mobile Home Park

SR 26

Sherwood Forest

Sugar Hill

Wake Robin

Willowbrook West

Other neighborhood(s) that you feel may be affected or specific rural areas.

For any of the above neighborhoods or any others you anticipate will have impacts from one or more Build Alternative alignments (Lines 1, 4, 7, 9 and 10) please complete the following.

Name of Neighborhood:
Identifying Characteristics <i>(for example: mostly Purdue faculty, large lots, mature landscaping, extremely quiet, walkable to XX park, daycare across the street, numerous bicycle commuters, few renters)</i>
Name of Neighborhood:
Identifying Characteristics <i>(for example: mostly Purdue faculty, large lots, mature landscaping, extremely quiet, walkable to XX park, daycare across the street, numerous bicycle commuters, few renters)</i>
Name of Neighborhood:
Identifying Characteristics <i>(for example: mostly Purdue faculty, large lots, mature landscaping, extremely quiet, walkable to XX park, daycare across the street, numerous bicycle commuters, few renters)</i>

Name of Neighborhood:

Identifying Characteristics *(for example: mostly Purdue faculty, large lots, mature landscaping, extremely quiet, walkable to XX park, daycare across the street, numerous bicycle commuters, few renters)*

Name of Neighborhood:

Identifying Characteristics *(for example: mostly Purdue faculty, large lots, mature landscaping, extremely quiet, walkable to XX park, daycare across the street, numerous bicycle commuters, few renters)*

Name of Neighborhood:

Identifying Characteristics *(for example: mostly Purdue faculty, large lots, mature landscaping, extremely quiet, walkable to XX park, daycare across the street, numerous bicycle commuters, few renters)*

Name of Neighborhood:

Identifying Characteristics *(for example: mostly Purdue faculty, large lots, mature landscaping, extremely quiet, walkable to XX park, daycare across the street, numerous bicycle commuters, few renters)*

Name of Neighborhood:

Identifying Characteristics *(for example: mostly Purdue faculty, large lots, mature landscaping, extremely quiet, walkable to XX park, daycare across the street, numerous bicycle commuters, few renters)*

Community Impact Analysis

At the meeting, we will discuss the following questions:

- Are there any known concentrations (e.g. group homes, nursing homes) of disabled or elderly persons within the Project Study Area?
- Are there identifiable concentrations of Spanish speakers / neighborhoods? Are they bilingual or mainly Spanish-speaking? Is language a barrier in Wabash Township?
- Where could someone looking for a home under \$100,000 be able to relocate?
- What do you consider other major investments – public or private – that will change life in your community?

Then we will do the small group exercise, which is attached (Matrix of Community Impacts for Lines 1, 4, 7, 9, and 10), with instructions provided below. The exercise will examine neighborhood-level impacts of each alignment. Please fill this in for your neighborhood before the meeting if you are able to do so. You might not be assigned to a group that analyzes your neighborhood at the meeting.

After the impact analysis exercise, we will also pose the following questions:

- Are there any concerns about any of the alignments' impacts on local business districts?
- Are there community impacts that are not captured by the neighborhood impacts?
 - Community Services
 - Recreation facilities
- Are there any differences in how the alignments would affect environmental justice (e.g. low income and/or minority) communities compared to the community at large?
- Are there other issues that need to be considered that will distinguish between the alternatives in terms of community impacts?
- Are there any impacts you foresee for the No-Build Alternative?

How will this information be used?

The study team will review the responses to these questions and use them collectively to provide additional detail in the Community Impact Assessment (CIA). Individual, detailed answers generally will not be used in the environmental document, nor will results be reported in any statistical fashion (since we are not polling a random or statistically representative sample). However, if conflicting responses are received, we may either report the range of responses or choose the response that is more frequently given and/or seems most consistent with logic and other responses.

Instructions for completing the community impact matrix:

Matrix Item	Instructions
General type of direct impacts (displacements, bisection)	Please describe in very general terms the types of direct (i.e., caused directly by the “footprint” of the new highway) community impacts that would occur with the alignment. Bear in mind that detailed analysis of displacements and acres of different impacts (land use, natural resources) will be completed by Baker.
Existing travel patterns	Briefly describe common destinations (work, shopping, recreation) and the means by which they are accessed (car, bicycle, foot)
How will the alignment alter automobile travel patterns?	Describe specific changes to automobile travel patterns and indicate if the change is an improvement, no difference from the present, or a negative impact (or mixed).
How will it alter bicycle and pedestrian travel patterns	Describe specific changes to bicycle and pedestrian travel patterns and indicate if the change is an improvement, no difference from the present, or a negative impact (or mixed).
Safety concerns	Does the construction of the alignment prompt any safety concerns for the neighborhood? If so, what are they?
Provision of community services	Would the provision of community services to the neighborhood, such as emergency services, trash collection, school buses, etc. be affected by the alternative? Indicate which services would be affected and the type of effect (positive or negative) as well as a brief description of the nature of the change. For example: School buses – negative – school bus stops would be on a busy highway or would be moved to the interior of the neighborhood.
Access to community facilities	Would the neighborhood residents experience a change in access (by car, foot, or bicycle) to any community facilities, such as libraries, schools, and parks? As above, indicate which facilities would be affected and the type of effect (positive or negative) as well as a brief description of the nature of the change.
Other concerns and interactions*	Are there factors that will interact with the highway alignment to produce additional neighborhood-specific impacts that should be considered? (For example, the alignment would remove the only buffer between the neighborhood and an agricultural area that produces dust.)
Level of change in community cohesion (negative high, negative medium, negative low, none, positive)	Community cohesion describes the extent to which members of the community interact and function as a unit. This can occur within neighborhoods as well as larger areas with a common focal point, such as a school or church. Please indicate the type (positive, neutral or negative) and severity (high, medium or low) of the impact for each neighborhood, and a brief description of the cause of the impact. For example: a high negative impact would indicate loss or physical separation of a substantial portion of the community. A medium negative impact would indicate areas are displaced or separated that would not substantially alter community dynamics. A low negative impact would suggest minimal disruption to community dynamics, and a positive impact would indicate that the community or community ties would be enhanced in some way. The level of existing community cohesiveness does have an effect on the level of impact – a less cohesive community might have more displacements, yielding a medium impact, compared to a highly cohesive community with a smaller number of displacements that has a high impact.

* Note that 1) Baker will provide detailed noise impact analysis in the environmental document, and 2) construction period impacts will be addressed during final design, including maintenance of traffic and mitigation of construction-period nuisances. We plan to discuss mitigation relative to these two subjects at the fourth CAC meeting.

Matrix of Community Impacts - LINE 1

LINE 1 Interaction	NEIGHBORHOOD					Non-Neighborhood-Specific Impacts
	Blackbird Farms	McCormick Place	Sherwood Forest	The Lodge	Other (specify)	
General type of direct impacts caused by Line 1 (displacements, bisection)						
Existing travel patterns						
How will Line 1 alter automobile travel patterns?						
How will Line 1 alter bicycle and pedestrian travel patterns?						
Safety concerns						
Provision of community services						
Access to community facilities						
Other concerns and interactions*						
Level of change in community cohesion (negative high, negative medium, negative low, none, positive)						

* Note that 1) Baker will provide detailed noise impact analysis in the environmental document, and 2) construction period impacts will be addressed during final design, including maintenance of traffic and mitigation of construction-period nuisances. We plan to discuss mitigation relative to these two subjects at the fourth CAC meeting.

Matrix of Community Impacts - LINE 4

LINE 4 Interaction	NEIGHBORHOOD					Non-Neighborhood- Specific Impacts
	Lindberg Village	Sherwood Forest	Wake Robin	Kerfoot Drive	Other (specify)	
General type of direct impacts caused by Line 4 (displacements, bisection)						
Existing travel patterns						
How will Line 4 alter automobile travel patterns?						
How will Line 4 alter bicycle and pedestrian travel patterns?						
Safety concerns						
Provision of community services						
Access to community facilities						
Other concerns and interactions*						
Level of change in community cohesion (negative high, negative medium, negative low, none, positive)						

* Note that 1) Baker will provide detailed noise impact analysis in the environmental document, and 2) construction period impacts will be addressed during final design, including maintenance of traffic and mitigation of construction-period nuisances. We plan to discuss mitigation relative to these two subjects at the fourth CAC meeting.

Matrix of Community Impacts - LINE 7

LINE 7 Interaction	NEIGHBORHOOD					Non-Neighborhood- Specific Impacts
	Sherwood Forest	Wake Robin	McCormick Place	Carrington Estates/ Pine View	Brindon Woods	
General type of direct impacts caused by Line 7 (displacements, bisection)						
Existing travel patterns						
How will Line 7 alter automobile travel patterns?						
How will Line 7 alter bicycle and pedestrian travel patterns?						
Safety concerns						
Provision of community services						
Access to community facilities						
Other concerns and interactions*						
Level of change in community cohesion (negative high, negative medium, negative low, none, positive)						

* Note that 1) Baker will provide detailed noise impact analysis in the environmental document, and 2) construction period impacts will be addressed during final design, including maintenance of traffic and mitigation of construction-period nuisances. We plan to discuss mitigation relative to these two subjects at the fourth CAC meeting.

Matrix of Community Impacts - LINE 9

LINE 9 Interaction	NEIGHBORHOOD					Non-Neighborhood-Specific Impacts
	Wake Robin	Point West	Carrington Estates	Brindon Woods	Other (specify)	
General type of direct impacts caused by Line 9 (displacements, bisection)						
Existing travel patterns						
How will Line 9 alter automobile travel patterns?						
How will Line 9 alter bicycle and pedestrian travel patterns?						
Safety concerns						
Provision of community services						
Access to community facilities						
Other concerns and interactions*						
Level of change in community cohesion (negative high, negative medium, negative low, none, positive)						

* Note that 1) Baker will provide detailed noise impact analysis in the environmental document, and 2) construction period impacts will be addressed during final design, including maintenance of traffic and mitigation of construction-period nuisances. We plan to discuss mitigation relative to these two subjects at the fourth CAC meeting.

Matrix of Community Impacts - LINE 10

LINE 10 Interaction	NEIGHBORHOOD					Non-Neighborhood- Specific Impacts
	Wake Robin	Point West	Pemberly Court	Kerfoot Drive	Other (specify)	
General type of direct impacts caused by Line 10 (displacements, bisection)						
Existing travel patterns						
How will Line 10 alter automobile travel patterns?						
How will Line 10 alter bicycle and pedestrian travel patterns?						
Safety concerns						
Provision of community services						
Access to community facilities						
Other concerns and interactions*						
Level of change in community cohesion (negative high, negative medium, negative low, none, positive)						

* Note that 1) Baker will provide detailed noise impact analysis in the environmental document, and 2) construction period impacts will be addressed during final design, including maintenance of traffic and mitigation of construction-period nuisances. We plan to discuss mitigation relative to these two subjects at the fourth CAC meeting.

CAC Meeting #3

Meeting Information Packet

Figures

Figure 1: Future & Existing Landuse

Figure 2: Preliminary Community Access

CAC Meeting #3
Meeting Information Packet

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS
(FAQs)

FAQs

Following is a list of Frequently Asked Questions. The answers to these questions are deliberately brief and, where appropriate, direct the reader to applicable sources of more detailed information. It is important to keep in mind that many aspects of the US 231 Relocation Study are considered *preliminary* and, as such, no final decisions have been made. Once a DRAFT Environmental Document has been completed, a public review period will be scheduled.

Comments received (via mail, email, and the website) will be answered through direct dialogue with staff members at public meetings, CAC meetings and within the document itself. Comments are reviewed on a regular basis for common themes, additional information important to the study, and for information to be used in the Community Impact Assessment task being performed.

We hope this FAQ section of the website helps you to understand more about the project and we look forward to seeing you at future US 231 Relocation Study meetings.

1.	<p>Q: What is the purpose and need for this leg of US 231?</p> <p>A: The Purpose & Need for the entire relocation of US 231 from south of CR 500S to US 52 was established in the 1987 DEIS and 1992 FEIS and corresponding ROD (the full text of these documents is available on the website and in the project repository). The purpose and need for the entire relocation was designed to ease traffic congestion and accidents in the area of the current US 231 (notably Northwestern Avenue, State Street, etc.); to conform to existing state and local transportation plans; and to meet the needs of future land use planning. The northern portion of the route between SR 26 and US 52 is necessary to complete the previously approved plans for the relocation of US 231.</p>
2.	<p>Q: Why were certain western alignments developed by Baker subsequently recommended for elimination from detailed study?</p> <p>A: Some western alignments do not meet the purpose and need for the proposed action because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) They lack conformity with existing plans (TCAPC, Purdue) that call for connections with extensions of Cherry Lane and Cumberland Avenue.2) According to current and future traffic models, they will not generate enough volume to lessen present (and future predicted) traffic congestion and accidents on roads and intersections near the Purdue University campus (i.e. Northwestern Avenue, McCormick Road, State Street, etc.). This is because traffic destined for the north side of West Lafayette is not likely to go very far west only to return eastward.3) They are inconsistent with the intent of local land use plans (TCAPC, Wabash Township), which call for maintaining the rural character of the area.

3.	<p>Q: Why isn't the No-Build Alternative being given greater consideration, since it remains "on the table?"</p> <p>A: The No-Build Alternative is carried forward as required by FHWA regulations, and is used as a base line for traffic, accident, and planning comparisons between the Build Alternative alignments. The No-Build Alternative remains "on the table", even though, as applied to the northern portion, it does not meet the purpose and need for the proposed action.</p>
4.	<p>Q: Is US 231 a "bypass," and if so, why don't you take it all the way to Montmorenci and connect it with US 231 out there?</p> <p>A: Relocated US 231 is not proposed as a "bypass" in the same sense as I-465 in Indianapolis (for example). It is not intended to reroute through traffic beyond the greater Lafayette/West Lafayette area. Rather, it is intended for use by local traffic and, as such, would not attract acceptable volumes if routed toward Montmorenci.</p>
5.	<p>Q: Will Relocated US 231 result in commercial businesses being developed along the route, as happened with US 52 and SR 26 south?</p> <p>A: US 231 will be a limited access highway with no curb cuts and intersections only with certain roads such as Cherry Lane (extended), SR 26 West, and Cumberland Avenue (extension).</p>
6.	<p>Q: What are the access and intersection considerations for Cherry Lane, SR 26, Lindberg Road, Cumberland Avenue, Klondike Road (if a western alignment is chosen) and US 52?</p> <p>A: In general, while various potential access points and intersections are being considered for alignments carried forward for more detailed study, these scenarios will not be expressly examined or determined until a Preferred Alternative is selected.</p>
7.	<p>Q: How will the northern terminus of US 231 at US 52 tie into the larger study of a future route to I-65?</p> <p>A: The study referred to is intended to examine a variety of possible routes for US 231 from I-70 to I-65. However, the US 231 Relocation Study (SR 26 to US 52), including a recommended terminus at US 52, is likely to be completed before US 231 from I-70 to I-65, in which case this study will incorporate that detail. Lastly, the US 231 Relocation Study (SR 26 to US 52) is a programmed, approved project with a ROD issued in 1992. Additional information about the US 231 from I-70 to I-65 study is available at www.corradino.com/us231.</p>

8.	<p>Q: We have heard that the cost to build the road is not a concern for elimination of alignments. Can you clarify this?</p> <p>A: Ultimately, cost is a factor in evaluating the final selection of a preferred alternative. For example, if two alternatives rate similarly in all other factors, then cost would be considered. However, cost is not considered a major factor in early evaluation and elimination of alignments, which is based mainly conformity to purpose and need and other fatal flaws (such as impacts to certain public parks, historic properties, etc.).</p>
9.	<p>Q: Can the project maps show more detail as to where current roads are?</p> <p>A: Project maps have been updated to show more detailed information, including neighborhoods, secondary roads, easier identification of each alignment, etc.</p>
10.	<p>Q: Can you please put more information (primarily the information given at the public meeting) up on the website?</p> <p>A: All public meeting information, CAC meeting materials, prior documents on the study, maps, etc. have been posted to this website. E-mail update subscribers receive notification when new information has been added to the site.</p>
11.	<p>Q: Is Baker (INDOT's consultant for the US 231 Relocation Study between SR 26 and US 52) communicating with the Corradino Group (INDOT's consultant for the US 231 from I-70 to I-65 Environmental Assessment) to ensure coordination between the two studies?</p> <p>A: Yes, both firms are in collaboration with each other.</p>
12.	<p>Q: How can I find out about meetings?</p> <p>A: INDOT sends press releases concerning upcoming meetings to local media before meetings. Also, as soon as meeting dates and locations are set, they are advertised on the homepage of this website. Project update e-mails are also sent to the public informing them of upcoming events. You can sign up to be added to the project e-mail and mailing lists at public meetings, via the website feedback page (www.relocate231.com/feedback.asp), via mail (Wendy Vachet, Project Manager, Michael Baker Jr., Inc., 701 E 83rd Avenue, Merrillville, IN 46410), or via fax (Wendy Vachet - 219-755-0233). Comments may also be submitted by any of the preceding methods.</p>
13.	<p>Q: Where will impacts to wetlands, floodplains, air quality, and noise levels be addressed?</p> <p>A: The impact on natural, human, and cultural environments will be investigated for alignments carried forward for detailed analysis and will be addressed in the DRAFT Environmental Document.</p>