



Meeting #3
May 19, 2016
North Dearborn Branch Library
6:00-8:00 p.m.

Advisory Committee Members:

Ms. Liz Morris, Dearborn County Councilmember
Ms. Mary Booker, alternate for Jennifer Hughes, Dearborn County Soil & Water Conservation District
Ms. Celeste Calvitto, alternate for Greg Gronwall, Bright Area Business Association
Mr. Greg Mathena, Assistant Chief, representing Chief Kevin Gick, Bright Volunteer Fire Department
Ms. Marilyn Hyland, Genesee & Wyoming Railroad

Project Team:

Mr. Mark Policinski, OKI, CEO/Executive Director
Ms. Robyn Bancroft, OKI Project Manager
Ms. Karen Whitaker, OKI Project Administrator
Ms. Ashley Patrick, OKI Communications Specialist
Mr. Dave Wormald, AECOM, Project Manager
Mr. Gary Mroczka, AECOM
Ms. Pegi Yocom, AECOM
Mr. Ted Grossardt, Vox Populi

Welcome and Approval of Minutes

Robyn Bancroft, staff, called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. She welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked attendees to introduce themselves.

Ms. Bancroft asked if there were any changes to the minutes of the January 27, 2016 meeting. There being none, Liz Morris moved to approve the minutes as written. Marilyn Hyland seconded the motion; motion carried.

Phase One: Data Collection Findings

Dave Wormald reported that the Consultant Team has completed the Red Flag Summary and Data Collection Summary Reports. The Red Flag Summary focuses on demographic information and existing environmental resources. The Data Collection Summary includes basemapping, traffic data, crashes and existing roadway information. Both reports have been posted on the study website. Mr. Wormald reminded the group that the study scope does not include field data collection. He also pointed out that additional environmental studies would need to be done for any potential improvement alternatives recommended by the study. Mr. Wormald stated that most of the information has previously been shared with the Advisory Committee at the last meeting. He highlighted key findings from the respective reports.

Robyn Bancroft summarized the public feedback received following the February 17 Public Open House and 30-day public comment period. She reminded the group that a copy of the Public Comment Summary Report is included on the study website, along with all of the individual comments that were received. She explained that the public's role is advisory to help the study team understand travel use and community values to guide study decisions. She reported that the top three desired study outcomes of those commenting were: to preserve the area's rural, small town feel; to maintain existing roads; and, to protect environmental resources.

Ms. Morris expressed her surprise at the low percentage of responses regarding the reduction of emergency response times.

Assistant Chief Mathena pointed out that Bright has a 24/7 EMS and volunteer fire department. He questioned whether this is taken into account. Mr. Wormald explained that EMS service area maps for Bright have been provided. The Harrison Fire Department provided response time and staffing information for the Harrison EMS service area. He stated that there is a brief summary EMS data included in the data collection report. He explained that they looked at emergency response travel times but there are many variables associated with staffing and availability for the volunteer department. Therefore, the study team could not provide definite conclusions concerning reductions in emergency response times resulting from potential roadway improvements. Assistant Chief Mathena reported that 75% of responses are EMS and occasionally there will be a dual response or possibly a third. Once they are dispatched, the trucks leave right away, for a second call the time is approximately 3 minutes and 4-5 minutes for a third call. He stated that they have data with response times for both fire and EMS. He explained that currently, the Bright department covers the top of the hill along North Dearborn Road and Harrison covers the bottom along I-74 and US-52

DRAFT Purpose & Need Statement

Mr. Wormald explained that a "Purpose and Need" is required by federal highway and state DOTs when applying for funds and environmental clearance. He explained that the study team would like to get input from the Advisory Committee to make confirm the identification of existing transportation deficiencies is accurate. The intention is to share this with the public at the

upcoming Public Open House and on the study website. He explained that the statement will remain a draft form and can be updated through the study process. He presented the draft purpose:

“To provide a modern route that improves travel between the Bright area and Interstate 74 area which satisfies INDOT’s Geometric 3R Design Criteria with a minimum operating speed of 45 mph to enhance network connectivity and traffic safety while preserving the rural quality of the area.”

Liz Morris expressed concern about an operating speed of 45 mph. She stated that this seems unrealistically high based on the topography of the area. Mr. Wormald pointed out that a goal of the study is to improve the existing roads to meet INDOT’s design criteria, however stating a limit in the Draft Purpose and Need Statement is not required. Mark Policinski suggested that the 45mph be stricken from the Draft Purpose and Need Statement.

There was some discussion regarding the term “modern.” Mr. Wormald stated that it was a term denoting that a roadway would meet current INDOT design criteria. Mark Policinski suggested changing the term “modern” route to “improved”. There was a consensus to make this change, along with striking the minimum operating speed of 45 mph.

Mr. Wormald further reviewed the Need Elements:

- Address Existing Roadway Deficiencies
 - Shoulders
 - Horizontal Curvature
 - Grades and Vertical Curves
 - Roadside Conditions
- Secondary Needs
 - Reduce Travel Time
 - Improve Level of Service (percent time following another vehicle)
 - Reduce Crash Rates
- Other Goals and Objectives
 - Preserve Rural Character
 - Minimize Environmental Impacts
 - Economic Development

He noted that the Study Goals will identify and evaluate improvements that will:

- Efficiently support a multi-modal roadway system
- Correct geometric roadway deficiencies
- Improve travel time, reliability and traffic flow
- Support economic prosperity through cost effective and efficient connectivity between the Bright area and I-74 to enhance transport of people, good and services to improve economic vitality

- Consider land use potential that accommodates growth in urban areas while maintaining the character of rural areas while also be consistent with state, regional, county and local city planning initiatives
- Preserve and protect natural resources and hillsides; improves or maintains air quality
- Address travel safety needs and reduce crashes

Ms. Morris stated that Dearborn County roads are in reasonably good shape for the topography. The County routinely spends \$250,000 on slips. Due to funding constraints, she commented that she does not see the proposed improvements happening. Mr. Wormald pointed out that these are hypothetical best case scenarios. Ms. Morris stated that the focus should be on a connection between Bright and I-74 rather than focusing on improving the existing roadways. Ms. Bancroft explained that at this point everything that would work to meet the Draft Purpose and Need Statement is “on the table” including improvement of existing roads and consideration of new roadways. Mr. Wormald stated that whenever a new road is proposed, it should be planned to meet current design criteria to the extent possible. He displayed a typical cross section which is based on the INDOT Design Manual for a local public agency Rural Collector which includes 12 foot lanes with 8 foot paved shoulders.

Phase Two: Conceptual Solutions

Mr. Wormald reviewed the draft conceptual solutions which included improvements to two existing roads (North Dearborn Road and Whites Hill Road) and three new connector roadway alternatives.

Mr. Wormald explained that improvements to existing roads includes the following:

Geometric Improvements

- Improve Horizontal Curvature
- Modify Vertical Profile
- Intersection Re-alignments

Maintenance Items

- Widen for shoulders where possible
- Remove roadside obstructions (trees, poles, fences, etc.)
- Add mailbox turnouts
- Replace or add guardrail as needed
- Improve signage
- Address drainage or slippage

Mr. Wormald reviewed three conceptual alternatives for a new roadway. He stressed that these alternatives have not been engineered or designed, but rather presented as preliminary planning considerations:

Alternative 1: North Dearborn Road to Whites Hill Road

Alternative 2: North Dearborn Road to Old US 52 via Carr Road

Alternative 3: North Dearborn Road to Old US 52 via State Line Road

Mr. Wormald reported that all three new connectors would work to reduce travel time (Alternative 1 by 30% and Alternatives 2 and 3 by 50%). He also reviewed the daily forecasted traffic volumes to share how many vehicles each concept would potentially carry on an average day (Alternative 1: 1,500 vehicles, Alternative 2: 2,200 vehicles and Alternative 3: 2,700 vehicles).

Mr. Wormald reviewed the Evaluation Matrix which compares different attributes to see how each alternative performs:

Category	Unit	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
New Length	Miles	2.56	3.64	3.56
Area	Acre	55	59	65
Parcels	each	20	54	26
Wetland	each	0	5	4
Streams	each	21	21	18
Flood Plain (new)	Linear feet	0	1,700	1,800
Average Daily Traffic	vehicles	1,500	2,200	2,700
Travel Time	Minutes	6.6	4.8	4.4
Cut	Cubic yards	839,000	383,000	496,000
Fill	Cubic yards	1,072,000	802,000	1,213,600
Bridge Area	Square feet		52,800	48,000
Estimated Costs	2016 year estimate (\$ Millions)	\$18-30M	\$32-55M	\$28-50M

Ms. Bancroft made the suggestion that the Alternative to improve Whites Hill and North Dearborn roads should be added to the Evaluation Matrix. There was a consensus to make this change.

Ms. Bancroft shared with the group that the study team was creating a survey to be used at the June 22nd Open House and online during the 30-day public comment period that would assist in gathering the public's input on how each of the alternatives performs in meeting the Draft Purpose and Needs Statement. Mr. Wormald stated that with feedback, the next step would be to utilize a revised Evaluation Matrix that would assist the study team in weighing the benefits of each alternative in order to move towards a study recommendation.

Timeline

Ms. Bancroft explained that following the Open House and 30-day public comment period, the study team will work to eliminate one or two alternatives from further consideration. The team will also refine the alternatives in order to reflect public usage and values. The refined alternatives will then be brought back to the Advisory Committee in mid/late September for the next meeting which will be followed by one last public open house. Mr. Wormald stated that it is his hope to have one existing and one new route to carry forward for consideration.

Adjournment

Ms. Bancroft thanked the Advisory Committee for their input and for helping to get the word out about the Pubic Open House.

The meeting concluded at 8:00 p.m.

klw