



**Meeting #4**  
**August 17, 2016**  
**North Dearborn Branch Library**  
**6:00-7:30 p.m.**

**Advisory Committee Members:**

Mr. Kevin Lynch, Chair, Dearborn County Commissioner  
Mr. Todd Listerman, Dearborn County Engineer  
Ms. Liz Morris, Dearborn County Councilmember  
Mr. Derek Walker, representing Mark McCormack, Dearborn County Plan Commission  
Ms. Jennifer Hughes, Dearborn County Soil & Water Conservation District  
Mr. Jim Ude, INDOT – Seymour District  
Mr. Greg Gronwall, Bright Area Business Association  
Ms. Marilyn Hyland, Genesee & Wyoming Railroad  
Mr. Dale Lutz, Resident-at-Large  
Mr. Jeff Stenger, Resident-at-Large  
Mr. John Browner, alternate for John Stenger, Resident-at-Large

**Study 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  
Dr. Ben Blandford, Vox Populi

**Guests:**

Mr. Doug Shelton, Resident  
Ms. Carolyn Marline, Resident  
Mr. Albert A. Witt, Resident

**Guests continued:**

Mr. Albert R.F. Witt, Resident  
Mr. Greg Vollmer, Resident  
Ms. Mary Graf, Resident  
Ms. Jenny Gruen, Resident  
Mr. Don Gruen, Resident  
Mr. Mark Blacksby  
Mr. Dan Blacksby, Resident  
Mr. Paul Blacksby, Landowner  
Mr. Brian Geis, Resident  
Mr. Steve Napier, Resident  
Mr. Charles Andrews, Resident  
Mr. Al Powell, Resident  
Ms. Jane Powell, Resident  
Mr. Tim Rees, Resident  
Mr. John C. Craig, Resident  
Ms. Amy Schenk, Resident  
Mr. Robert Suttor, Resident  
Mr. Matthew Scholle, Resident  
Ms. Julia Scholle, Resident  
Ms. Tracy Coon, Resident  
Ms. Amanda Harper, Bright Beacon  
Mr. William Jackson  
Mr. Benedict Witt  
Ms. Kelly Ravenna  
Mr. Chuck Schoemaker  
Mr. Brian DeBruler, Resident of Bright  
Mr. Jim Price, Whites Hill  
Ms. Melissa Dennis, Whites Hill  
Ms. Karen Brandt, Resident  
Ms. Mary Lynn Hayes, Sneakville  
Ms. Herta Bedunah, Resident  
Ms. Gloria DeLucio, Resident  
Ms. Denise Freitag Burdill, Register  
Ms. Cybil Lachenman, Resident  
Ms. Cathy Geis, Resident  
Ms. Bonnie Gohs

**Welcome and Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Kevin Lynch, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. He welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that the meeting was of the Advisory Committee but he would take questions from the public at the end if there was time.

Mr. Lynch asked if there were any changes to the minutes of the May 19, 2016 meeting. There being none, Greg Gronwall moved to approve the minutes as written. Liz Morris seconded the motion; motion carried.

### **Wrap-Up of Phase Two: Conceptual Solutions**

Ms. Bancroft reviewed the Draft Purpose & Need Statement: “To provide improved travel between the Bright area and Interstate 74 that meets INDOT’s design criteria, reduces travel time, and enhances connectivity and traffic safety while preserving the rural quality.” The goals of the study are to: preserve rural quality of the area; minimize environmental impacts; improve travel safety; and, enhance roadway connectivity and economic vitality.”

Ms. Bancroft highlighted the Phase 2 survey results. She reported that surveys were received from 506 individuals, 74% of which said they live in the Bright 74 Study Area. Ms. Bancroft reported the below percentages of survey takers that stated the Study goal was “important” to them:

Preserve rural quality of the area	81%
Minimize environmental impacts	74%
Improve travel safety	39%
Enhance roadway connectivity and economic vitality	15%

Ms. Bancroft reviewed each of the alternatives and the responses as to how the survey respondents felt each concept addressed the study goals:

<b>Concept 1:</b>			
<b>Improve Existing Roads</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Somewhat</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Preserve Rural Quality of the Area	20%	16%	64%
Minimize Environmental Impacts	21%	18%	62%
Improve Travel Safety	19%	29%	52%
Enhance Roadway Connectivity & Economic Vitality	39%	33%	27%

<b>Concept 2:</b>			
<b>Whites Hill Connector</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Somewhat</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Preserve Rural Quality of the Area	60%	24%	17%
Minimize Environmental Impacts	61%	25%	14%
Improve Travel Safety	44%	32%	24%
Enhance Roadway Connectivity & Economic Vitality	52%	32%	16%

<b>Concept 3:</b>			
<b>Carr Road Connector</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Somewhat</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Preserve Rural Quality of the Area	79%	14%	7%
Minimize Environmental Impacts	79%	15%	6%
Improve Travel Safety	62%	24%	14%
Enhance Roadway Connectivity & Economic Vitality	61%	22%	17%

<b>Concept 4:</b>			
<b>State Line Road Connector</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Somewhat</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Preserve Rural Quality of the Area	77%	13%	10%
Minimize Environmental Impacts	78%	14%	8%
Improve Travel Safety	56%	23%	21%
Enhance Roadway Connectivity & Economic Vitality	56%	20%	24%

Ms. Bancroft stated that 55% of those who took the survey made a comment. She provided a summary of the recurring comments:

- No new roads
- Priority should be given to straightening, improving, repairing existing roads (this was frequently accompanied by written support for Concept 1)
- Preserve the rural, quiet, small town feel of the Bright Area
- Improvements are not worth the financial costs
- Improvements needed to other roadways not included in the four concepts
- Do not want more traffic, speeding, noise
- Concerns regarding negative impact to environmental/natural resources
- Concerns regarding safety for people, children, families, horses, bicyclists
- Concerns regarding proximity of concepts to residential properties and risk to property values

Ms. Bancroft explained that after the public comment period, she made calls to all Advisory Committee members and had discussions with all but four of the members. She stated that their input was reflective of what was heard from the public and was helpful to the Study Team in evaluating the information that would be presented to the committee today and to the public at the next open house and on the website.

Ms. Bancroft reported that the summary report of the Phase 2 public comment period is available on the study website and has been posted since July 29. A copy of every survey received is also posted.

### **Phase Three: Preliminary Alternatives and Final Recommendations**

Mr. Mroczka displayed a comparison chart which was provided at the last Advisory Committee meeting and at the public open house which compared each of the four concepts. From this, an evaluation matrix was prepared. Based on this screening of the concepts, the recommendation is that there be no further evaluation of Concepts 3 and 4 based on Advisory Committee and public input and costs/impacts vs. benefits. The Advisory Committee members were in consensus with this recommendation.

Mr. Mroczka reported that based on refined evaluation, Concept 2 costs and impacts are significantly higher than Concept 1-Improve Existing Roadways.

Mr. Lynch asked how many of the stream crossings were blue line streams and require culverts. Mr. Mroczka stated that they are mostly all culvert.

Ms. Hughes asked whether it was considered on permitting for streams. She explained that when there is a defined bank and channel, permitting is required through several agencies. Mr. Mroczka stated that some were blue lined. Ms. Hughes pointed out that the Army Corp of Engineers, IDEM & IDNR get to make the determination if a channel needs a permit or not, not the engineer of the project or whether it's a blue line on a map.

Mr. Lutz questioned the beginning and ending points for the evaluation of travel time. Mr. Mroczka explained that the routes all begin at the intersection of State Line Road and North Dearborn Road and end where I-74 crosses over US 52.

Mr. Mroczka stated that based on this information and the relative cost differences between the two concepts, the Study Team's recommendation is to advance Concept 1 Improvements to Existing Roads and eliminate Concept 2 Whites Hill Connector. Ms. Bancroft further explained that although Concept 2 did not receive as favorable public support as Concept 1, the Study Team conducted more refined evaluation of both Concept 1 and Concept 2 as a measure of due diligence to evaluate which may be the most cost-effective means to address the goals of the study (improve all of existing North Dearborn and Whites Hill Roads or a new connector section and improvements to a portion of each existing road).

Ms. Morris questioned basis for the forecast of 1,500 ADT for Concept 2 - Whites Hill Road Connector. Mr. Mroczka explained that there are 1,600 vehicles daily on the existing road and it is anticipated that the majority would shift to the new roadway based the study travel demand model.

Mr. Wormald discussed the components of the preliminary recommended concept (Concept 1 – Improve Existing Roads):

- Enhanced Maintenance
  - Widen shoulders where possible
  - Add lighting at key intersections
  - Remove roadside obstructions
  - Add mailbox turnouts
  - Repair, replace or add guardrail as needed
  - Improve signage
  - Address drainage or slippage

Mr. Wormald pointed out that enhanced maintenance includes improvements that could be implemented independently of the rehabilitation of the existing roadways and could assist to improve safety and travel speeds. These could be done in spot locations as resources allow or as a systematically for the entire corridor.

- Inventory and Study of Other Interstate Connections from the Bright Area
  - North Dearborn Road (east of State Line Road)
  - Jamison Road
  - North Dearborn Road (between Whites Hill Road and SR 1)
  - Sand Run Road (between State Line Road and the Ohio State Line)

Mr. Wormald explained that the focus of the study was to improve travel between Bright and Interstate 74 at the Harrison/Brookville Road interchange. However, the study team heard from the Advisory Committee during discussions at previous meetings that other interstate connections to the area also have deficiencies and should be studied as well, so staff is recommending future evaluation of these roadway segments roads used to access the interstate. Evaluation of corridors linking Bright to interchanges in Ohio will require coordination with the Hamilton County Engineer's office and the Ohio Department of Transportation.

Mr. Stenger requested that traffic counts be included on the map illustrating the other interstate connections recommended for future study.

- INDOT Future Improvements
  - State Route 46 improvements
    - Replace SR 46 bridge over Whitewater River
    - Improve sight distance on US 52 east of SR 46

Mr. Wormald reported that the SR 46 Bridge over the Whitewater River is functionally obsolete. He explained that INDOT's inspection indicated a 20-year design life remains for the bridge. However, the bridge has substandard shoulders and roadside barriers. The bridge would be targeted for long-term replacement and staff desire to recognize and document this need in the Study's recommendations.

Mr. Wormald also explained that there are sight distance issues when exiting from westbound I-74 to US 52. In addition, field observation and input from the advisory committee indicates that operating speeds on US 52 in that area are likely exceeding design speed of 45 mph. He pointed out that if there are future improvements to US 52 in that area, consideration should be made to improve sight distances. Inclusion of improvements to US 52 east of SR 46 is another item that the staff desire to recognize and document in the Study's recommendations.

Mr. Lynch asked Mr. Listerman when was the last County bridge survey was conducted. Mr. Listerman said a review of all the County bridges was made at the same time and that there are other bridges with lower ratings. Mr. Wormald explained that the SR 46 Bridge in question received a sufficiency rating of 59 out of 100. Mr. Listerman explained that if a bridge receives a sufficiency ranking of 50 or below, the project can be eligible for federal funding for replacement.

- North Dearborn Road Improvements

This recommendation includes improving the vertical and horizontal geometry of the existing road to straighten curve and flatten grades, as well as some widening to provide recommended shoulders. There would be no lane additions etc. He explained that in order to achieve current INDOT design standards, the roadway should have a 12' lane and with least 4-6' shoulders. He cautioned that the maps displayed are a high level planning review and not a detailed parcel-by-parcel evaluation.

Mr. Wormald explained that they anticipate the proposed improvements could be broken into two or more possible implementation phases. For the public open house, staff will provide a cost estimate for all the North Dearborn Improvements.

- Ms. Morris questioned whether there is any data to show accidents in the area. Mr. Wormald explained that this information was shown at earlier meetings during the first phase of the Study. While there is some concentration of crashes in the restrictive curves, the overall segment of North Dearborn did not have a crash rate that exceeded the statewide average for rural collectors. Whites Hill Road Improvements

Mr. Wormald explained that the proposed improvements to Whites Hill Road are similar to North Dearborn Road and include the same cross section that would bring the road to INDOT design standards. The proposed improvements could be implemented in three or more future phases, which could be completed independently., He pointed out that a section of the proposed improvements relocates the roadway off the current alignment to the west, but relocation of existing residences are not anticipated at this time. The project would include the reconnection of altered driveways.

Mr. Stenger questioned whether extra cost was built into the estimates for utilities. He pointed out that there is a sewer line in the area that was previously impacted during road improvements to the lower portion of Whites Hill Road. Mr. Listerman explained that he thinks the proposed roadway work is far enough to the west so that the sewer line will not be impacted, but staff will look into it. He pointed out that the electrical transmission line and towers may be a more costly consideration as the proposed improvements evaluated in the future.

Mr. Wormald explained that the proposed improvements would make the road safer and more reliable by improving the geometry the roadway should provide better site distance and be more passable during winter weather.

Mr. Lynch asked what type of improvements would be recommended to the I-74 overpasses. Mr. Wormald explained that the piers are probably too close to the road and with any widening of Whites Hill Road; guardrails would likely need to be installed to protect the piers. However, he pointed out that they are not looking at changes to the I-

74 interchange itself or proposing any new interchanges. They are only looking at access to the existing Interstate 74 ramps.

- Consideration of Roundabouts (North Dearborn/State Line Roads intersection and North Dearborn/Whites Hill Roads intersection)

Mr. Wormald raised the topic of possible consideration of roundabouts at the intersection of North Dearborn/State Line Roads and North Dearborn/Whites Hill Roads. He explained that roundabouts lessen the severity of accidents and operate more efficiently with moderate traffic volumes in certain locations. A roundabout would be approximately 120' in diameter at the center circle. He stated that this is an option that the study team plans to ask the public in the next survey whether this is something they would be open to for consideration.

Mr. Listerman explained that his office has had questions from people regarding the use of roundabouts, so he would like to get input from the public whether this is something they would like studied. He explained that the use of roundabouts is increasing in popularity through the region, Indiana and U.S.

In response to a question from Mr. Lynch, Mr. Wormald explained that a roundabout would have one lane.

The Advisory Committee was in consensus to move forward with the recommended alternatives to be presented at the public open house, including:

- Concept 1 Components
  - Enhanced Maintenance
  - North Dearborn Road Improvements
  - Whites Hill Road Improvements
- INDOT SR 46/US 52 Future Improvements
- Evaluation of other Interstate Connections

### **Timeline**

Ms. Bancroft reviewed the timeline for the remainder of the study:

September 14: Final Public Open House

Preliminary recommendation exhibit boards/survey and Conceptual Solutions report will be posted to the study website

September 14 – October 14: 30-day Final Public Comment Period

Public comment summary report will be posted to the study website on October 19

October 26: Final Advisory Committee Meeting



Mr. Lynch pointed out that the number of surveys from the first and second public house increased from 453 to 506 and expressed his hope to see another increase in completed surveys. He stated that he hopes to hear from as many individuals as possible and urged committee members to help spread the word.

### **Adjournment**

Mr. Lynch thanked the committee for their time in attending the meeting.  
The meeting concluded at 7:30 p.m.

Following the conclusion of the Advisory Committee, public comment was received from:

Brian DeBruler  
Melissa Dennis  
Al Powell  
Bridgette Hoffman  
Tracy Coon

klw