

THE NEW US 31 HAMILTON COUNTY

DATE/TIME: May 8, 2008; 8:00am-11:30am

FILE CODE:

LOCATION: Baker and Daniels

SUBJECT: CAC Meeting #4

ATTENDEES: CAC Members, Representative stakeholders, Project Team Members, and other interested parties

NOTES BY: Project Team

CC: DocC, Attendees

PURPOSE: To introduce the CAC members to the alternatives that are being studied for three of the interchanges along the US 31 Hamilton County corridor, to inform the members of the projected status of current crossroads, and to update the members on interchange recommendations based solely on traffic.

DISCUSSION:

Jennifer Dzwonar began by welcoming everyone to the meeting and quickly briefing everyone in attendance on the agenda for the day. She then passed the floor to Steve Fleming. Steve walked everyone through the current anticipated process schedule. He noted that by May 26th the Environmental Team hopes to have the SDEIS (Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement) to the EPA for printing in the Federal Register. Assuming this happens and all goes as planned, a Public Hearing will be planned for late June/early July.

A CAC Member inquired as to when construction on the I-465 interchange will occur. That is dependent on the I-465/69 Northeast project and the Keystone Parkway project. We cannot have adjacent interchanges under construction at the same time. The I-465/31 construction is likely to occur in 2012 or 2013.

Jason Hignite then gave an overview of the **Purpose and Need** for the project. There was a need for the upgrade when the project was originally undertaken, and the need for the project has only increased based on recent traffic and safety assessments. The Purpose and Need of the project focus on reducing congestion, improving safety, and providing reliable and efficient movement.

Dawn Kroh, team leader for Context Sensitive Solutions, gave an overview of **trail and pedestrian crossings** and the advancement of the CAC pedestrian and bicycle task force. She explained that crossings will have a hierarchy of needs, meaning that some locations will have just sidewalks and others will have multi-use trails. A needs survey was passed out to the task force for their comment on these hierarchies. She stated that not many of these surveys have

been returned, so she cannot provide feedback at this time.

CAC members asked if the team was consulting the many alternative transportation plans that have been developed and if there would be a report summary? The answer was Yes.

The meeting then moved into a discussion of **interchange designs**. Steve Fleming presented the two SR 32 interchange design options. One option included a tight diamond and the other option, a single point urban interchange (SPUI). In both of the alignments US 31 is shifted to the west because of Westfield High School being a protected 4(f) resource that must be avoided. He stated that the tight diamond is likely the better option because of traffic movements. The SPUI will force a long wait at the signal because of the unbalanced flow of traffic that is present at the intersection. This causes a loss of efficiency. He also mentioned concern for Sun Park Dr and Westfield Park Dr (west of SR 32/US 31 intersection) where many accidents occur. The proposed plan will shift Westfield Park Dr to the west to form one intersection with Sun Park Dr.

A CAC member asked if the first intersections away from the interchange would be signaled, including those by the school. The team said this was not likely warranted in the construction year, but may be in the future.

A CAC member asked which design for SR 32 is better for bicycles and pedestrians. The tight diamond is better. Although, the pedestrian-trails committee says the SR 32 area is not a priority crossing. The Midland Trace Trail and 181st St. areas are more of a priority.

Jason Hignite then discussed environmental impacts at the SR 32 interchange. With the largest footprint scenario, both interchange options show the same impacts. The impacts are: two residences, 25 commercial properties, seven hazardous-material sites, noise impacts, and the wellhead protection area.

There was a discussion of rail/transit accommodations. The current median design could accommodate rail lines, but does not have room for stations. The bridge height would accommodate only certain types of transit. The SDEIS will make general statements about the possibility of transit in order to solicit public comment. The FEIS (Final Environmental Impact Statement) and ROD (Record of Decision) would make the commitment or consideration. Rail transportation is not a part of the current US 31 project.

A CAC member mentioned that the new Express Bus from 126th St. is full. The US 31 project will help the buses move through the corridor, though bus and rapid transit lanes are not in the current design, as they affect the traffic flow in other lanes.

Steve Fleming asked for pros and cons about the preliminary designs for the SR 32 interchange. Only one pro was named with the tight diamond option: pedestrian safety. Pros for the SPUI option included: a narrow footprint that could possibly lead to fewer displacements and more queuing space for traffic. The con for the SPUI was the longer delay time at the signal due to unbalanced traffic movement. There is no signal currently planned at the school, but that may change. The Monon Trail will remain the same both north and south of SR 32.

RW Armstrong presented the interchange options for 146th /151st streets. Alternative 1 is the Preferred Alternative Mitigation Plan option. Alternative 2 includes the PAMP collector-distributor (connector road) option with slip ramps and a bridge at Greyhound Pass. This option works well. Alternative 3 includes an interchange at Greyhound Pass. This option is less than desirable as it creates a tight merge/weave for traffic. Alternative 4 includes an interchange at Rangeline Road. This alternative routes traffic destined to 146th Street area through Clay Terrace, which results in pedestrian safety concerns.

CAC members mentioned the current traffic challenges on Western Way. A CAC member asked if there could be a northbound slip ramp at 146th Street to the CD road, as it would be good to

get access at Rangeline and 146th Street. A CAC member also asked about a ramp connection or flyover to Lowe's Way. The designers said these would result in additional business impacts, plus elevation changes there are quite significant.

A CAC member said it would be risky to count on improvements outlined in Westfield's thoroughfare plan, as the city likely cannot afford to implement the plan. Another CAC member suggested using project cost savings to help pay for the Westfield improvements.

The pros and cons of the options at 146th/151st Interchange included the following:

Original with Slip Ramp:

Pros: Emergency vehicle access and it's the best alternative for geometrics and traffic

Cons: Lack of access to 146th Street from north, lack of access to Rangeline, Western Way need and local funding limitations.

Rangeline Road:

Pros: Additional access point to this development, may relieve traffic on 146th.

Cons: Burden of traffic on Clay Terrace and safety concerns at Clay Terrace

Greyhound Pass: Pros and cons not weighed because this option was deemed unworkable.

The I-465/106th Street interchange option was presented by Kevin Bischel. He stated that the proximity of 96th Street limits what can be done to the south of this interchange and that 96th Street must work with whatever design is selected. He noted that a system-to-system interchange will be used to connect I-465 to US 31. There will be a signal for traffic headed southbound on US 31 from westbound I-465. This is where the freeway ends.

The second option showed a reduced footprint, reducing about one acre of wetland impacts. This option might allow for a ramp to the roundabout at Pennsylvania St. Signals may need to be put back in at 106th and Pennsylvania St. if volumes are high enough. On both options signage for the hospital would be posted on I-465.

CAC members expressed that they do not want to revert to having signals at 106th Street.

A CAC member mentioned a concern with having a traffic signal at I-465 and US 31 where the freeway ends. The response was that there will be traffic calming and speed slowing to account for this, similar to I-69 when it becomes Binford Blvd.

There were concerns about weaving with 106th being so close, as shown in the original option. Yes, fewer merge points in option 2 is better. Traffic analysis results in an acceptable weave Level of Service between 465 and 106th St. with option 2.

A CAC member asked about traffic at 96th Street and if we could tie in directly with the development at Duke. The answer was that if Carmel owns the road, it is a public road and the ramp can tie into it. If Duke owns the road then it is a private road and we cannot tie into it.

Pros and cons for each interchange were discussed.

Alternative 1:

Pros: CD System may reduce weave conflicts.

Cons: Width of footprint impacts on area, more bridges ,more costly, difficulty signing the merge points, short decision time, early decision for 106 to be made while on 465.

Alternative 2:

Pros: Tighter footprint – less impact, fewer lanes separated, fewer bridges – less cost, and better access to Pennsylvania, more traditional movements between the system interchange at 465 and the service interchange at 106.

Cons: Short Weave distance from 465 to 106.

Kimberly Lutz then reviewed the crossroads and cul-de-sacs and what current crossroads will either be closed or converted into cul-de-sacs with the new alignment.

- I- 465 – Interchange
- 103rd – cul-de-sac
- 106th – Interchange
- 111th – Crosses over US 31
- 116th - Interchange
- Old Meridian St – NB Slip Ramp
- 126th – Crosses over US 31
- 131st – Interchange
- 136th – Interchange
- Monon Trail – Crosses under
- Circle Drive- Access redirected to Clay Terrace
- Rangeline Rd – Crosses Under
- 146th – Split Interchange
- Greyhound Pass – (Either right in/right out access or crosses over), final treatment dependent on rap configuration
- 151st – Split Interchange
- S. Union / Westfield Blvd –cul-de-sac (under consideration for overpass)
- 156th – cul-de-sac
- Buena Vista Drive – no access, rerouted to Farr Hills Dr.
- 161st – Interchange
- 169th – Crosses under
- Park Street - cul-de-sac
- SR 32 – Interchange
- 181st – Crosses over
- South Dr. or N. Glen Dr. – Closed- No Cul-de-sac
- Blackburn Ave – cul-de-sac
- N. Union – Removing pavement between US 31 and N. Union
- 191st – Interchange
- 196th – cul-de-sac
- 202nd – cul-de-sac
- 203rd – cul-de-sac
- SR 38 – Interchange

A connection for S. Union St. is likely a commitment, but INDOT and the team are still working on an alignment.

A CAC member asked about sidewalks on 111th. Sidewalks are currently proposed for the south

side of 111th.

A CAC member asked about the height of the walls going in at 126th. The height of those walls has not yet been determined or designed.

Dave Henkel gave a summary of the preferred alternatives for previously discussed interchanges based **only on traffic data**. He made it clear that these are not the recommended options, as they are being called preferred based on traffic data alone.

Interchange	Preferred Level of Service Alternative
I-465	condensed c-d
106 th St	tight diamond
116 th St	single point urban interchange
Old Meridian St	northbound slip off ramp
131 st St	roundabout
136 th St	tight diamond
146 th /151 st St	slip ramps
161 st St	roundabout
SR 32	diamond
191 st St	tight diamond
SR 38	½ folded diamond

A CAC member expressed that a preference to not to make 136st a tight diamond, as people don't mind driving through all the roundabouts since they are not going around the full circle.

Emergency vehicles like the roundabouts because of continuous flow. Roundabouts with two lanes are preferred for the emergency vehicles.

Jennifer Dzwonar closed the meeting asking for any additional questions relating to information presented at today's meeting. It was noted that the public would be able to view the SDEIS by the end of May or early June. It will include preliminary interchange alternatives that the CAC has seen. These design alternatives have also been posted to the web site but these are not final. Designs on the interchange types can even change after the FEIS (Final Environmental Impact Statement) through an Additional Information document. Jennifer noted that the next CAC meeting is tentatively set for Friday June 6, 2008 from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30am.