

# APPENDIX C: DRAFT LEVEL 3 SCREENING REPORT COMMENT/RESPONSE MATRICES

---

The tables provided in this appendix list all comments received through the active *Draft Level 3 Screening Report* public comment period, which extended from November 12, 2024, through December 13, 2024. Comments received from the public and stakeholder groups are included in **Table C-1**, and comments/letters received from federal, state, and local resource agencies are included in **Table C-2**. No comments were received from the tribal nations during the comment period. Initial responses were provided to the public during the comment period via email, if requested; the responses included herein build upon those initial responses based on ongoing work to reflect comments received.

Please note that comment text in the table reflects submission content verbatim. Personal information has been removed or redacted to protect privacy. Also, some of the received comments covered multiple topics and have been subdivided for purposes of providing responses.

In response to all comments, it is important to note that all concepts shown in the *Draft Level 3 Screening Report* are preliminary and subject to change. Future studies will determine the actual configuration of any specific improvements.

Table C-1 – Responses to Comments Received during the Level 3 Screening Comment Period

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
1	11/19/2024		Miami Central - General	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: No build	As discussed in the <i>Final Level 3 Screening Report</i> , the “No Build” option will be carried forward into any subsequent analysis. However, the “No Build” option would not address any of the needs identified in the <i>Final Purpose and Need Report</i> ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a> ).
2	11/20/2024	Economic Development, Mobility, Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor, Draft Level 3 Report	Miami Central - General	This nonsense will close businesses and inconvenience the people of Miami County more than help. You need to take into consideration the people and families who live and work here. This is not about helping us, it's about your agenda. You cannot maintain the current roadways, but you want to build more. There are holes in the ramps at 31 and 24, 24 is extremely rough since the chip and seal fiasco that it will cause the cruise control to turn off.	The ProPEL US 31 Study has been conducted to create smarter transportation systems that build stronger communities by addressing the needs identified in the <i>Final Purpose and Need Report</i> ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a> ). The concerns about holes in the ramps on the US 31 and US 24 interchange have been relayed for future maintenance considerations.
3	11/21/2024		Miami Central - CR 100 N	Of the packages that were carried forward... What I like most is it will eliminate some potentially dangerous intersections and eliminate a stop light in the corridor. What I like least is the elimination of the entrance at 100 N. which is where the truck stop is currently. That would eliminate the only fuel source between St. Rd 18 and Rochester, making it difficult for those local to get fuel other than going into Peru or Logansport. It would also eliminate the only truck rest stop in the area.	Maximizing the safety of our roads is a priority for INDOT. Current and projected (i.e., year 2045) roadway operating conditions were analyzed as part of the study. This information can be found in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Existing Transportation Conditions Report</i> , which is available on the study website ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a> ). Based on the analysis, safety was identified as a concern throughout the study area. As a result, the study team evaluated alternatives to improve safety along US 31 by reducing the number and severity of crashes in the study area, including potentially removing the stoplight at County Road 100 North.  Of the three improvement packages carried forward in the Miami Central Planning Segment, two (Packages 2 and 3) would maintain the entrance to the gas station on County Road 100 North. Package 4 would eliminate this entrance due to spacing requirements for a freeway.
4	11/30/2024	Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor, Draft Level 3 Report	Miami Central - CR 300 N	w 300 N on package 4 to close is a very good choice for safety. People come down the hill from the south, and people pulling out from 300n would cause an accident. By experience, I have seen this because people entering 31 come out slowly.	Improvement Package 4 (along with Packages 2 and 3) will be carried forward for consideration.
5	12/5/2024	Safety	Miami Central - CR 300 N	I live on 300 north in Miami county. My address is not addressed in this plan. My question is, if I have a heart attack, will Peru's ambulance go into Cass county to get to me; or will I get Cass county emergency services? This needs to be addressed!!! Other people live in this area too	Emergency services have been coordinated throughout the study and would be coordinated with during the project development process for any projects that move forward from this study.
6	12/9/2024	Draft Level 3 Report	Miami Central - CR 100 N	Closing or right-in-right out exit would be detrimental to our business at County Road 100. We have invested a substantial amount of money into our property. There has to be another option to help keep our business open.	Of the improvement packages that will be carried forward for consideration, Package 2 would provide a directional median opening at County Road 100 North, Package 3 would be a right-in/right-out intersection, and the intersection would be closed in Package 4. For any projects that move forward from this PEL study, coordination would occur with any impacted property owners, and efforts would be made to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate impacts.
7	12/9/2024		Miami Central - CR 100 N	Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? All of these packages would be detrimental to our business at the CR 100 intersection where we have a substantial amount of money invested.	Of the Improvement Packages that will be carried forward for consideration, Package 2 would provide a directional median opening at County Road 100 North, Package 3 would be a right-in/right-out intersection, and the intersection would be closed in Package 4. For any projects that move forward from this PEL study, coordination would occur with any impacted property owners and efforts would be made to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate impacts.

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
8	12/16/2024		Miami Central - CR 100 N	Of the packages that were recommended... What I like most is Package 2 What I like least is Package 3 Of the packages that were carried forward... What I like most is no build What I like least is package 4 Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Please preserve as much access as possible at 100 N	The “No-Build” alternative, along with Packages 2, 3, and 4, will be carried forward for consideration. Of the Improvement Packages that will be carried forward for consideration, Package 2 would provide a directional median opening at County Road 100 North, Package 3 would be a right-in/right-out intersection, and the intersection would be closed in Package 4. For any projects that move forward from this PEL study, coordination would occur with any impacted property owners and efforts would be made to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate impacts.
9	11/14/2024	Bike and Pedestrian, Economic Development, Environmental, Mobility, Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor	Peru - W Airport Rd	Is Airport road going to have an exit and entrance in Miami county ? Yes or No	Of the four Improvement Packages that will be carried forward for consideration, two packages (Packages 2 and 4) would provide right-in/right-out access for Airport Road, while the other two packages (Packages 3 and 5) would close the intersection. Please note there is potential for these options to be mixed and matched between the Improvement Packages in future studies.
10	11/15/2024	Safety	Peru - CR 300 S / Mougans Rd	In my opinion, the one that shuts off the majority of the access roads like 300 s is the best. I live right but business 31 and 300s and that is a nasty intersection. And it will slow the traffic down on 300s they drive like idiots.	Improvement Package 5, which closes the most intersections within this segment, will be carried forward for consideration.
11	11/19/2024		Peru - General	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: 3	Improvement Package 3 will be carried forward for consideration.
12	11/19/2024	Overall US 31 Corridor	Peru - W Airport Rd	Sease drive and airport road should be closed to US 31 access.	Of the four Improvement Packages that will be carried forward for consideration, two packages (Packages 2 and 3) would maintain access to Sease Drive, while two packages (Packages 4 and 5) would realign Sease Drive and close off its current access. Two packages (Packages 2 and 4) would provide right-in/right-out access for Airport Road, while the other two packages (Packages 3 and 5) would close the intersection. Please note, there is potential for these options to be mixed and matched between the Improvement Packages in future studies.
13	11/19/2024		Peru - W Airport Rd	Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? We want Airport Road closed. We know now it is a speeding shortcut for north bound bus. It is horrible	Of the four Improvement Packages that will be carried forward for consideration, two packages (Packages 2 and 4) would provide right-in/right-out access for Airport Road, while the other two packages (Packages 3 and 5) would close the intersection. Please note there is potential for these options to be mixed and matched between the Improvement Packages in future studies.
14	11/19/2024		Peru - W Airport Rd	Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? I want Airport Road access closed. We live on the road and do not want the traffic using the road as a shortcut	Of the four Improvement Packages that will be carried forward for consideration, two packages (Packages 2 and 4) would provide right-in/right-out access for Airport Road, while the other two packages (Packages 3 and 5) would close the intersection. Please note there is potential for these options to be mixed and matched between the Improvement Packages in future studies.
15	11/19/2024		Peru - W Blair Pike Rd / Division Rd	Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Pinson Rd/Blair Pike needs lighting	Roadway lighting on US31 was carried forward as a complementary concept in the <i>Final Level 2 Screening Report</i> ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a> ). As noted in the <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i> , roadway lighting was too detailed to consider in this planning study but should be considered during future design phases of projects at all interchanges, RCIs and other innovative intersections for INDOT lighting guidelines.

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
16	11/21/2024		Peru - CR 400 S	Of the packages that were recommended... What I like most is package #3. It seems to address the major safety, improves mobility and keeps accessibility to certain key businesses and areas. Another good one is package #5, I think it would also be helpful in improving safety while also keeping access to all areas. Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? My family and I travel this area frequently as one of our farm locations is just west of US 31 on 400 S. Moving farm equipment across and down US 31 in recent years has become a major safety concern of ours. To us US 31 is getting dangerous getting on and off and traveling along it as the volume of traffic and speed seems to be always increasing. I for one prefer to avoid it whenever I can.	Improvement Packages 3 and 5 will both be carried forward for consideration.  In response to comments received, additional overpasses have been added at County Road West 300 North (Sharpsville Planning Segment) and County Road West 500 South (Tipton Planning Segment). Furthermore, the local farm bureaus have been coordinated with throughout the study.
17	11/26/2024		Peru - General	Of the packages that were recommended... What I like most is the no build option. What I like least is Package 2, 3, 4, and 5. Of the packages that were carried forward... What I like most is the no build option. What I like least is the Package 2, 3, 4, and 5.	As discussed in the <i>Final Level 3 Screening Report</i> , the "No Build" option will be carried forward into any subsequent analysis. However, the "No Build" option would not address any of the needs identified in the <i>Final Purpose and Need Report</i> ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a> ).
18	12/2/2024	Economic Development, Mobility, Overall US 31 Corridor	Peru - General	Package 3 looks to be the best one for the Peru segment.	Improvement Package 3 will be carried forward for consideration.
19	12/12/2024		Peru - CR 400 S	Of the packages that were recommended... What I like most is Package 3 Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? I prefer package 3. It provides the best alternatives for 400S and an interchange for Bus 31	Improvement Package 3 will be carried forward for consideration.
20	12/12/2024	Economic Development, Mobility, Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor, Draft Level 3 Report	Peru - General	This study is a farce. No questions were answered at any public meeting and even this form has eaten my responses, forcing me to start over repeatedly and claiming that there are "errors" in filling out the form. INDOT needs to know that the company doing this study has failed miserably. The feedback local people offered over a year ago did not make it into the study. The proposed "right turn only" intersections will cut off ambulance access to Indianapolis at its fastest route (Blair Pike). The gentleman in charge of this project couldn't even tell me where the hospital in our county was. He supposedly studied access and safety for the last two years and doesn't know where the hospital is? The proposed J turns at the air base will force moving traffic to come to a complete stop before joining 60 mile per hour traffic. "Mobility" is code for "drive through the county without stopping" in this study. The gentleman in charge told us at a public meeting that there were local businesses to want this increased "mobility" but when questioned, he couldn't name	Over the course of the ProPEL US 31 South study, the study team has worked diligently to meaningfully engage local residents, businesses, and other study stakeholders to solicit and consider their input about the future of US 31 in the study area. These efforts are documented in the <i>Resource Agency, Stakeholder &amp; Public Involvement Summary #1, #2, and #3</i> , which can be found on the study website ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a> ).  As part of the alternatives development and evaluation phase of the study, three levels of screening were conducted. The draft screening reports were published for public review and comment. The final screening reports included individual replies to comments received during the public comment period.  As noted in the <i>Final Universe of Alternatives (Level 1) Screening Report</i> , a common theme of the public comments received to date is that maintaining local access to/from US 31 (i.e., alternatives with less control of access) is important and should be considered as part of the PEL study.

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				any local businesses. He also mentioned there were "statewide objectives" at a local meeting, but he wouldn't tell us what they were, apart from "mobility." Nothing about this proposal is helpful to the local residents or local businesses... instead it impedes local traffic and causes unnecessary harm. This "study" needs to go back to school, because to date, it deserves nothing short of a failing grade.	As noted in the <i>Final Level 3 Screening Report</i> , the Expressway Lite facility type was developed in direct response to the public comments received throughout the study. Residents and other local stakeholders requested improved mobility through reduction or elimination of traffic signals without sacrificing accessibility to/from US 31. After considering these comments, the Expressway Lite facility type was developed to combine the driveway access aspects of arterial without signals (free flow) with the increased access management of an expressway (free flow).
21	12/14/2024	Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor, Draft Level 3 Report	Peru - General	There needs to be a bypass like around Kokomo. That road is so dangerous to get out onto! You all know this and have the stats to support the claim. Many deadly accidents on that stretch. It's loaded with fast traffic and there's hardly any openings for those attempting to cross or join. I would love a reply that indicates you've seen this comment.	A bypass was analyzed as part of the <i>Final Universe of Alternatives (Level 1) Screening Report</i> ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/">https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/</a> ). The Bypass Alternative was dismissed from further consideration as it is not practical based on its extraordinarily high cost of construction, the expected environmental impacts, and because it is not appropriate in scope and scale.
22	11/14/2024		Grissom - CR 900 S	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: Package 4 Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Bunker hill Dragway needs access for truck and trailers	Improvement Package 4 will be carried forward for consideration.  Three of the four packages carried forward for consideration (Packages 3, 4, and 5) will maintain access to County Road West 900 South via either a directional median opening or right-in/right-out access. Package 6 would close this intersection.
23	11/14/2024		Grissom - General	Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: No interchange at 600S, move to 500S. Move interchange from 850S to 800S	The US 31/State Route 218 North Junction intersection has the highest safety concern in the study area and carries a significantly higher volume of traffic than County Road 500 South, as shown in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Existing Transportation Conditions Report</i> ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/">https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/</a> ).  In the Grissom Planning Segment Improvement Packages 4 and 6, the interchange has been shifted from County Road 850 South to County Road 800 South. These changes were made as a result of an updated urban area boundary, which allows for the placement of an interchange at County Road 800 South that meets interchange spacing guidelines. This change is also consistent with the Miami County Comprehensive Plan.
24	11/14/2024		Grissom - SR 218 N	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: No full interchange at 600S	Three of the four packages carried forward for consideration (Packages 3, 4, and 5) would not construct a full interchange at County Road 600 South, while Package 6, also carried forward, would construct a full interchange. Please note there is potential for these options to be mixed and matched between the Improvement Packages in future studies.
25	11/19/2024	Overall US 31 Corridor	Grissom - CR 500 S	Concerned about 500 South in Miami County. The road has heavy Camper, motorhome and boat traffic going to Mississenewa reservoir. The current situation is not safe because of lengthy units sticking out into traffic. Something to help cross over would be ideal.	In Improvement Package 4, County Road 500 South has been revised from a right-in/right-out intersection to a directional median opening due to concerns associated with access to/from US 31 at this location. The turn lanes off US 31 South would be lengthened to better accommodate larger vehicles and queues of traffic.
26	11/19/2024		Grissom - General	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: 4 Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? The old railroad bridge needs raised. A truck hit it a few weeks ago. Or, lower US 31 roadway	Improvement Package 4 will be carried forward for consideration.  Your comment on the railroad bridge has been noted. That bridge is not under INDOT jurisdiction. Coordination with the railroad would occur during the project development process of any project that moves forward in this area.

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
27	11/19/2024		Grissom - General	<p>Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: Package 3 because it has least impact on our property. Least like packages 5 and 6 due to that it would take an extreme, large part of our property</p> <p>Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: Package 3 is most desireable</p>	Improvement Packages 3 and 5 will both be carried forward for consideration. Coordination with any impacted property owners would occur during the project development process of any project that moves forward in this area.
28	11/21/2024		Grissom - General	Of the packages that were carried forward... What I like most is package #5 because it would make mobility and safety a lot better. However, what I don't like is how many homes and businesses it would wipe out. I would maybe wonder about a mix of this design and one that would provide right in/right out access at Hoosier Blvd., Pipe Creek Mill Rd., CR 560S., and Graber Dr. Traffic going and coming out of these areas would mostly be residential and lighter	Improvement Package 5 will be carried forward for consideration. Please note, there is potential for some options to be mixed and matched between the Improvement Packages in future studies.
29	11/21/2024		Grissom - General	<p>Of the packages that were recommended... What I like most is limiting of conflict points What I like least is limiting access to Grissom Air Museum</p> <p>Of the packages that were carried forward... What I like most is #3 What I like least is #4</p>	<p>Improvement Packages 3 and 4 will both be carried forward for consideration.</p> <p>Maximizing the safety of our roads is a priority for INDOT. Current and projected (i.e., year 2045) roadway operating conditions were analyzed as part of the study. This information can be found in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Existing Transportation Conditions Report</i>, which is available on the study website (<a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a>). Based on the analysis, safety was identified as a concern throughout the study area. As a result, the study team evaluated alternatives to improve safety along US 31 by reducing the number and severity of crashes in the study area, including ways to reduce conflict points throughout the study area.</p> <p>Coordination with any impacted property owners would occur during the project development process of any project that moves forward in this area.</p>
30	11/27/2024		Grissom - General	<p>Of the packages that were recommended... What I like most is Package 3. It provides the open intersections and lowers the impact to farming, businesses and citizens living and working in this section of the project. What I like least is Package 4. But not by much. Generally speaking, I'm in favor of the Expressway light, free flow concept. I just don't see this being as helpful for this area then Package 3.</p> <p>Of the packages that were carried forward... What I like most is really only Package 5. The other two close too many intercetions that won't be helpful for farming or citizen living and working in and around these intersections. What I like least is doing nothing. Package 5 is the only one that does something. Albeit not much.</p> <p>Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? The 31 &amp; 218 intersection might be the most dangerous one in</p>	<p>Improvement Packages 3, 4, 5, and 6 will be carried forward for consideration. The "No Build" option will also be carried forward into any subsequent analysis. However, the "No Build" option would not address any of the needs identified in the <i>Final Purpose and Need Report</i> (<a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a>).</p> <p>The US 31/State Route 218 North Junction intersection has the highest safety concern in the study area and carries a significantly higher volume of traffic than County Road 500 South, as shown in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Existing Transportation Conditions Report</i> (<a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a>). All of the Improvement Packages carried forward at this location would help address these safety issues.</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				the state. I have no data to support that but I have witnessed plenty of truck, cars, motorcycles and RV's blow through there and accidents of all kinds happen there.	
31	12/3/2024		Grissom - Hoosier Blvd	<p>Of the packages that were recommended... What I like most is that the stop lights have been eliminated as they are not safe, and there are accidents there almost daily.</p> <p>What I like least is the restriction of access to and from Grissom ARB in either direction at Hoosier Blvd.</p> <p>Of the packages that were carried forward... What I like most is the free flow of traffic. What I like least is doing nothing, or completely restricting access to Hoosier Blvd. Grissom Air Force Base must have multiple access points to the highway.</p> <p>Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? I think package 4 is the best option but would be better if you use the Hoosier Blvd access from package 3 in Package 4. This will allow for better access to and from Grissom AFB as it is the largest employer in the County and also allows access to the multiple businesses by the Air Force base.</p>	<p>Traffic signals have been removed in all of the Improvement Packages that will be carried forward in this study.</p> <p>Access would be maintained at Hoosier Boulevard in three of the Improvement Packages carried forward for consideration (Packages 3, 4, and 5). Please note, there is potential for some options to be mixed and matched between the Improvement Packages in future studies. Package 6 would close access to Hoosier Boulevard due to the limited access requirements of a freeway.</p> <p>The "No Build" option also will be carried forward into any subsequent analysis. However, the "No Build" option would not address any of the needs identified in the <i>Final Purpose and Need Report</i> (<a href="https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/">https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/</a>).</p>
32	12/3/2024	Draft Level 3 Report	Grissom - SR 218 N	Have you considered moving 218 to 500? This would eliminate the intersections North and South of Grissom saving a significant amount of money. Except for a small intersection in Onward, 500 is a straight shot connecting IN-19 with US-35. 218 currently goes through many tight turns in Bunker Hill and Santa Fe.	<p>The US 31/State Route 218 North Junction intersection has the highest safety concern in the study area and carries a significantly higher volume of traffic than County Road 500 South, as shown in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Existing Transportation Conditions Report</i> (<a href="https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/">https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/</a>).</p> <p>In Improvement Package 4, County Road 500 South has been revised from a right-in/right-out intersection to a directional median opening due to concerns associated with access to/from US 31 at this location. The turn lanes off US 31 South would be lengthened to better accommodate larger vehicles and queues of traffic.</p>
33	12/4/2024	Economic Development, Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor	Grissom - Hoosier Blvd	I am curious why in no scenario is there a substantial improvement to US 31 and Hoosier Blvd. There is significant traffic at this intersection from both sides of U.S. 31, but primarily from the West side. The traffic numbers at this intersection may rival those at 218 intersections. This seems odd in that Grissom Aeroplex is home to a community of probably 3,000 which exceeds Bunker Hill, many businesses and the US Air Force Reserves. Also, I don't see a good scenario addressing truck traffic from the South Industrial Park in any scenario with one totally eliminating the 800S intersection. There are more people likely employed in the industrial park than the State IDOC facility. I see the proximity discussion to 218 but why isn't the traffic at Hoosier and 800 a higher priority than proximity to intersections that see less traffic?	<p>The US 31/State Route 218 North Junction intersection has the highest safety concern in the study area and carries a significantly higher volume of traffic than County Road 500 South, as shown in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Existing Transportation Conditions Report</i> (<a href="https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/">https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/</a>). Access would be maintained at Hoosier Boulevard in three of the Improvement Packages carried forward for consideration (Packages 3, 4, and 5). Please note there is potential for some options to be mixed and matched between the Improvement Packages in future studies. Package 6 would close access to Hoosier Boulevard due to the limited access requirements of a freeway.</p> <p>For the Grissom Planning Segment Improvement Packages 4 and 6, the interchange has been shifted from County Road 850 South to County Road 800 South. These changes were made as a result of an updated urban area boundary, which allows for the placement of an interchange at County Road 800 South that meets interchange spacing guidelines. This change is also consistent with the Miami County Comprehensive Plan.</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
34	12/5/2024	Safety, Draft Level 3 Report	Grissom - CR 500 S	Thank you for your work on this important project. I would ask that we continue to look at the intersection of US 31 and 500 S in Miami County. That intersection is the primary way that users access Mississinewa State Park. Especially from Spring to Fall there is a large amount of traffic that is both coming to the park and leaving the park and traveling both north and south bound on US 31. Most of that traffic is also pulling trailers with campers and boats. If we do not allow the traffic to travel West on 500 S and then turn onto Southbound 31, then Miami County will need to work with the state on finding an alternative for all of that traffic. I don't have any official stats, but I am sure DNR can provide some information regarding the number of reservations and visitors who travel to the state park from counties south of Miami. Miami County Plan Commission is looking to update its comprehensive plan and that 500 South corridor will be a focus of the transportation plan moving forward.	In Improvement Package 4, County Road 500 South has been revised from a right-in/right-out intersection to a directional median opening due to concerns associated with access to/from US 31 at this location. However, left-turn movements from crossroads onto US 31 pose some of the greatest safety issues in the study area due to severe right-angle crashes. Coordination with Miami County would continue to occur during the project development process of any projects that move forward from this study.
35	12/5/2024	Mobility, Safety	Grissom - SR 218 N	A lot of traffic comes north to Grissom ARB. If the left-hand (west) turn is closed off onto Hoosier Boulevard, it will have to continue on up to 218 to go west. This could be a major inconvenience to those who work at Grissom ARB. The Tee intersection at 218 will deconflict all traffic with and underpass or overpass.	The US 31/State Route 218 North Junction intersection has the highest safety concern in the study area and carries a significantly higher volume of traffic than County Road 500 South, as shown in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Existing Transportation Conditions Report</i> ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a> ). Access would be maintained at Hoosier Boulevard in three of the Improvement Packages carried forward for consideration (Packages 3, 4, and 5). Please note there is potential for some options to be mixed and matched between the Improvement Packages in future studies. Package 6 would close access to Hoosier Boulevard due to the limited access requirements of a freeway.  While all four Improvement Packages that will be carried forward for consideration (Packages 3, 4, 5, and 6) would improve safety at the State Route 218 North Junction intersection, Packages 5 and 6 would be grade separated. Please note there is potential for some options to be mixed and matched between the Improvement Packages in future studies.
36	12/9/2024		Grissom - General	Of the packages that were recommended... What I like most is Package 4 and the Right in Right out access only at Hoosier Blvd which helps to eliminate traffic back up trying to turn left and crossing US 31. This is essential to help protect the the final approach course to the Grissom Runway but to also eliminate any potential hazards or accidents that could carry into the the Clear Zone for the Runway. Also, the US31 and 850 South Interchange helps to reduce the amount of traffic at 800 South which is prone to accidents, causing MedEvac Helicopter assistance and interfering with Air Traffic.  What I like least is that Eastbound 218 and 31 has not been eliminated in either recommended packages. I also am concerned that US 31 and County Road 850 South intersection interchange, may be giving people the false impression that this would be the way they are to access Grissom	Improvement Packages 4 and 6 will both be carried forward for consideration.  However, for the Grissom Planning Segment Improvement Packages 4 and 6, the interchange has been shifted from County Road 850 South to County Road 800 South. These changes were made as a result of an updated urban area boundary, which allows for the placement of an interchange at County Road 800 South that meets interchange spacing guidelines. This change is also consistent with the Miami County Comprehensive Plan.  State Route 218 South Junction (eastbound) is one of the Primary Intersections outlined in the <i>Final Level 2 Screening Report</i> ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a> ), which is why access would be maintained in three of the four Improvement Packages that will be carried forward for consideration (Packages 3, 4, and 5). Please note, there is potential for some options to be mixed and matched between the Improvement Packages in future studies.

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				<p>ARB as the video states the Grissom Aeroplex. It needs to be made clear that access to Grissom ARB cannot be made from this interchange.</p> <p>Of the packages that were carried forward... What I like most is everything about package 6. It eliminates access at 800 South, 218 East and at Hoosier Blvd. This keeps traffic flowing past the approach end of the runway at Grissom and eliminates potential back-ups and hazards to air traffic. However, again, it needs to be made clear that Grissom ARB access at 850 South Interchange is not possible and that access would have to be made via 218 West.</p> <p>What I like least is that there is still access to 31 from 218 East but at least it is only right in right out.</p>	
37	12/11/2024		Grissom - CR 850 S	<p>Of the packages that were recommended... What I like most is Package 3 Arterial Freeflow What I like least is Package 4</p> <p>Of the packages that were carried forward... What I like most is Package 5 What I like least is Package 6</p> <p>Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Package 3 is my preference. The packages with an interchange at 850S imply that the interchange provides more efficient access to Grissom Aeroplex. This is only true for the areas south of the Grissom runway. The road marked as S Innovative Way crosses the Grissom ARB runway clear zone and is closed to non - Air Force service vehicles. This cannot be used as an entry to Grissom Aeroplex areas north of the runway. Therefore, these options reduce entry into the main Grissom Aeroplex to the 218 N route. This will cause many issues especially on training weekends.</p>	<p>Improvement Packages 3, 4, 5, and 6 will be carried forward for consideration.</p> <p>Please note, for the Grissom Planning Segment Improvement Packages 4 and 6, the interchange has been shifted from County Road 850 South to County Road 800 South. These changes were made as a result of an updated urban area boundary, which allows for the placement of an interchange at County Road 800 South that meets interchange spacing guidelines. This change is also consistent with the Miami County Comprehensive Plan.</p>
38	12/12/2024	Overall US 31 Corridor	Grissom - CR 500 S	Potentially interested in the sale of Valley Mobile Home trailer park, 3015 and 3017 West City Road 500S Peru Indiana 46970	Right-of-way acquisition is not included as part of this study. However, INDOT does have a Voluntary Property Purchase Program (VPPP) to improve safety and mobility on US 31. More information on the VPPP can be found online at <a href="https://www.in.gov/indot/projects/us-31-project/">https://www.in.gov/indot/projects/us-31-project/</a> . The study team suggests contacting INDOT at 1-855-INDOT4U (1-855-463-6848).
39	11/14/2024		Miami South - General	<p>Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: Package 5/Package 3</p> <p>Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Connect Apperson way NE to Cassville Rd. Connect 1350S to 600N. Connect Nancy Dr to Cassville Rd</p>	<p>Improvement Packages 3 and 5 will be carried forward for consideration.</p> <p>Apperson Way and Nancy Drive are closed in Packages 3, 4, and 5. County Road 1350 S is closed in Package 5. For any project that moves forward that closes access to a roadway, additional analysis would be conducted during the project development process and associated National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis to minimize or mitigate impacts from each closure.</p>
40	11/19/2024		Miami South - General	Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: First choice	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment. Unfortunately, it is unclear as to which Improvement Package this comment is referring.

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					Improvement Packages 2, 3, 4, and 5 will be carried forward for consideration.
41	11/19/2024		Miami South - General	Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: 1st choice	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment. Unfortunately, it is unclear as to which Improvement Package this comment is referring. Improvement Packages 2, 3, 4, and 5 will be carried forward for consideration.
42	11/19/2024		Miami South - General	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: PKG 2  Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: We drive south to work everyday (Kokomo)	Improvement Package 2 will be carried forward for consideration.
43	11/19/2024		Miami South - General	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: #3 package easiest to cross 31 on 18 and to get on 31 N & S Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? There is an 18 inch diameter gas line west of 31 along highway 18 and south of highway 18 on the west side of 31	Improvement Package 3 will be carried forward for consideration.  Thank you for your note on the gas line. Known utilities have been analyzed as part of this study, and additional analysis would be conducted during the project development process for any project that moves forward from this study.
44	11/19/2024		Miami South - General	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: Package 3 is highly recommended. It is the safest option on the board for schools, farmers, truck drivers, and regular traffic. Package two will absolutely not work and poses huge safety concerns for school bus drivers, farmers and truck drivers. This option is impossible to work for farmers and truckers due to equipment size at speeds.  Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: Pack 3 because it works (common sense)  Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? I own ZZ Disel on state road 18. Contact me with any questions or help I can provide with what I see/witness on a daily basis.	Improvement Packages 2 and 3 will be carried forward for consideration. Local farm bureaus and the Indiana Motor Trucking Association have been coordinated with throughout the study. Additional coordination would occur during the project development process of any projects that move forward from this study.  The study team contacted the commenter directly to follow-up on the offer for additional information related to their personal driving experience.
45	11/19/2024		Miami South - SR 18	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: J turns will not be good. Too many semis and farm equipment Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: This would work the best for everyone and the safest Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? There needs to be no J turns on 18 and 31	A"J-turn" is one of several alternatives that fall within the family of Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs). Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> </ul>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p>
46	11/19/2024		Miami South - SR 18	<p>Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: State RT 18 expressway lite is the best way to go for safety. Do not use the reduced conflict. It is a death trap in this location</p> <p>Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: Freeway, free flow</p>	<p>Improvement Packages 2, 3, 4, and 5 will be carried forward for consideration.</p> <p>Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p>
47	11/19/2024		Miami South - SR 18	<p>Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: Highway 18 overpass, easy on and off the highway and easy over to the west side of 31. We are an older farming community and 18 is essential to most roads</p> <p>Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: Having to speed up to cross oncoming traffic then get in slow lane, very dangerous</p> <p>Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? 18 has a lot of semis and when crossroads are closed for farmers large tractors and equipment would need room. 31 18 overpass would be the best for them. Probably would be the best to go north of 18 with overpass.</p>	<p>Left-turn movements from crossroads onto US 31 pose some of the greatest safety issues in the study area due to severe right-angle crashes. Therefore, all four improvement packages carried forward for consideration (Packages 2, 3, 4, and 5) would address these issues at State Route 18 through a Reduced Conflict Intersection (RCI) or interchange.</p> <p>Local farm bureaus and the national truck network have been coordinated with throughout the study. Additional coordination would occur during the project development process of any projects that move forward from this study.</p>
48	11/21/2024		Miami South - General	<p>Of the packages that were recommended... What I like most is limiting of access points</p> <p>Of the packages that were carried forward... What I like most is #3 What I like least is #5</p>	<p>Improvement Packages 3 and 5 will be carried forward for consideration.</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
49	11/21/2024	Economic Development, Environmental, Mobility, Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor	Miami South - SR 18	SR 18 provides a route for livestock trucks to deliver livestock (swine) to the processing facility at Delphi, IN. The intersection improvements should take into consideration the need for these trucks to minimize sharp turning movements that can shift the loads and cause overturning. An accident of an overturned truck loaded with 180 hogs will result in the shutdown of southbound US 31 for an extended period of time.	All of the improvement packages carried forward for consideration (Packages 2, 3, 4, and 5) were designed to accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length.  Local farm bureaus and the national truck network have been coordinated with throughout the study. Additional coordination would occur during the project development process of any projects that move forward from this study.
50	12/5/2024		Miami South - General	The plans say nothing about my intersection 1000south	The intersection you mentioned was not considered as part of the study for several reasons, including: this segment between US 31 and CR 400 W is not a roadway designated in INDOT's Functional Classification System Application ( <a href="https://www.in.gov/indot/resources/maps/functional-classification-and-urban-area-boundary/">https://www.in.gov/indot/resources/maps/functional-classification-and-urban-area-boundary/</a> ); a field review indicated that this roadway segment functions as an unpaved field access between US 31 and CR 400 W; and this segment is not recognized and discussed in the Miami County Comprehensive Plan. Although not specifically considered as part of the study, the study anticipates this low volume access point would either be converted to a right-in/right-out intersection or closed as part of the Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration.
51	11/14/2024		Sharpsville - General	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: #3 no RCIs  Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: #5, but put intersection at 525N. Bring the road to it from Sharpsville  Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Do not use RCIs. They are not big enough for farm equipment. Farm equipment can not clear the intersection with 31 traffic	Improvement Packages 2, 3, and 5 will be carried forward for consideration.  As stated in the <i>Final Level 3 Screening Report</i> , the interchange alternative at County Road 550/525 North presented in the <i>Final Level 2 Alternatives Report</i> was eliminated from further consideration due to interchange spacing guidelines.  Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.
52	11/14/2024		Sharpsville - General	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: Wont work for farmers and business needing to cross 31.	In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i> , an overpass has been added at County Road West 300 North (in the Sharpsville Planning Segment) to each

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				<p>Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: Package 5 is the only proposed option that will work for the machinery and loaded, heavy trucks</p> <p>Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? We must have direct access for large machinery crossing 31. I would have to go 6 or more miles out of my way to reach fields right across from each other E/W of 31</p>	Improvement Package carried forward for further consideration (Packages 2, 3, and 5). This will allow for better east-west mobility for vehicles, including farm equipment and trucks.
53	11/14/2024		Sharpsville - General	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: I like package 2	Improvement Package 2 will be carried forward for consideration.
54	11/14/2024		Sharpsville - General	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: I like package 3	Improvement Package 3 will be carried forward for consideration.
55	11/14/2024		Sharpsville - General	<p>Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: I like package 2!!! We need fire and medical access</p> <p>Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: I don't want package 5!</p>	Improvement Packages 2 and 5 will be carried forward for consideration. Emergency services have been coordinated throughout the study and would be coordinated with during the project development process for any projects that move forward from this study.
56	11/14/2024		Sharpsville - General	<p>Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: Too much emphasis and money on 1/2 mile stretch. Gives no more access east-west</p> <p>Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: Gives access east west no problem going N/S to find 31 access</p> <p>Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? We need access east west for semis and farm equipment 600 too narrow and dangerous</p>	In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i> , an overpass has been added at County Road West 300 North (in the Sharpsville Planning Segment) to each Improvement Package carried forward for further consideration (Packages 2, 3, and 5). This will allow for better east-west mobility for vehicles, including farm equipment and trucks.
57	11/15/2024	Mobility, Safety	Sharpsville - CR 300 N	I am specifically addressing the Sharpsville section of 4.1 miles. Our farm is equally split on the east and west side of US 31, with multiple crossings a day being made for business, as well as personal purposes. We would be greatly and negatively impacted by safety with Package #2. Crossing 31 to make a Uturn with the DMO model would be dangerous, if possible, with large farm equipment and loaded semis of grain. We use multiple trucks and diverse drivers, putting the risk for us and US 31 travelers at increased risk. We would be greatly and negatively impacted with mobility with Package #3, requiring us drive multiple miles with every trip to cross US 31. The safety issue would increase the response time of First Responders to our family and community emergencies on the west side of 31. It would also greatly channel at least half of the East/West crossings of 31 to County Rd 600, which is dangerously narrow in two lengthy stretches. The	In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i> , an overpass has been added at County Road West 300 North (in the Sharpsville Planning Segment) to each Improvement Package carried forward for further consideration (Packages 2, 3, and 5). This will allow for better east-west mobility for vehicles, including farm equipment and trucks.

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				current circumstances make is challenging. This package would make it harrowing and inescapably dangerous, with inevitable accidents and increased risk of fatalities. It would put our family and community at unacceptably higher risk. Option #5 is acceptable in light of safety and mobility. The overpass on 300 N would reduce the crossing traffic on 600 N by more than half, as 300 N would become a passage of choice. It would reduce the congestion at choke points on 600 N. It would provide increased access for First Responders to the West side in Prairie Township. It would save us multiple miles a day with the overpass at 300 N. Multiply that by the number of users and it is a huge number for total miles saved per day/year.	
58	11/15/2024	Overall US 31 Corridor	Sharpsville - CR 300 N	For the agriculture community to maintain some continuity with both sides of US 31 there has to an overpass at 300 North and 600 North ,which already exist ,. It is not feasible for the agriculture community to incur such a great cost increase with only crossover at 600 North and Division road.	In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i> , an overpass has been added at County Road West 300 North (in the Sharpsville Planning Segment) to each Improvement Package carried forward for further consideration (Packages 2, 3, and 5). This will allow for better east-west mobility for vehicles, including farm equipment and trucks.
59	11/15/2024	Mobility	Sharpsville - CR 300 N	I am a farmer that will be directly impacted by the improvements specifically on the Sharpsville section of the project. Literally the only option that won't affect me adversely is package 5. Without a direct overpass access I would be forced to drive 6 miles out of my way to access pieces of property that otherwise would be just barely across 31 from each other. There is zero way I could or should try and turn right onto 31 & look for a u turn while in a tractor pulling a piece of equipment or a combine. It would even be a questionable decision in a loaded semi. I know from experience behind both wheels that cars going highway speed don't like to slow down to let equipment move about doing their things. Esp when the road is being billed as limited access. If I'm in a car I have no problem only being able to access 31 at sr 28 to the south or sr 26 to the north. I'm pro growth and definitely pro safety of travel. So I have no problems with limiting access to an interstate style highway and actually prefer it. My issue is the problem it directly causes me to not be able to get across it. I'm almost exactly between the overpass at 600 N & whatever ends up happening at Division road.	In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i> , an overpass has been added at County Road West 300 North (in the Sharpsville Planning Segment) to each Improvement Package carried forward for further consideration (Packages 2, 3, and 5). This will allow for better east-west mobility for vehicles, including farm equipment and trucks.
60	11/25/2024		Sharpsville - General	Of the packages that were recommended... What I like most is Expressway Light would allow access across 31 as long as U-turns were placed. What I like least is Limited access for the northern part of our county Of the packages that were carried forward... What I like most is Nothing What I like least is Cuts off the east and west travel Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? The citizens of Tipton County deserve access across 31, one in the north, one in the center and one in the south	In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i> , an overpass has been added at County Road West 300 North (in the Sharpsville Planning Segment) to each Improvement Package carried forward for further consideration (Packages 2, 3, and 5). This will allow for better east-west mobility for vehicles, including farm equipment and trucks.  As discussed in the <i>Final Level 3 Screening Report</i> , the "No Build" option will be carried forward into any subsequent analysis. However, the "No Build" option would not address any of the needs identified in the <i>Final Purpose and Need Report</i> ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/">https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/</a> ).

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
61	12/12/2024	Safety, Draft Level 3 Report	Sharpsville - General	For the Sharpsville Planning Segment, I feel an alternative utilizing individual parts of Packages 2, 3 and 5 should be considered. Most of Package 2 would work with the following changes. W 550 N should be changed from a Reduced Conflict Intersection to a Directional Median Opening as shown for County Roads 200, 375 and 450. County Road 300 N should be an Overpass as shown in Package 5. This would allow Emergency vehicle, School Buses and Farm Equipment to have an additional route to travel East and West without negatively affecting traffic flow along US31. It would be best if this Overpass could also include ramps to and from CR300N.	In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i> , County Road 550 South has been revised to a Directional Median Opening in Package 3.  Also, in response to public comments, an overpass has been added at County Road West 300 North (in the Sharpsville Planning Segment) to each Improvement Package carried forward for further consideration (Packages 2, 3, and 5). This will allow for better east-west mobility for vehicles, including farm equipment and trucks. However, an interchange was not analyzed at this location due to interchange spacing guidelines.  Please note, there is potential for some options to be mixed and matched between the Improvement Packages in future studies.
62	11/12/2024	Safety	Tipton - Division Rd	Please eliminate the dangerous stoplight on us31 North of Ind 28 known as division road.	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would not include traffic signals at Division Road.
63	11/13/2024		Tipton - General	I'm calling because I have a couple of questions about section 3.6, Tipton planning. I live at essentially Division and Meridian, and Meridian hits Division. I have definably been impacted by the giant roundabout by Toyota. The diverted traffic that has been on 28, the new segment between 31 and 19. Many of the trucks do not take 19 south. They skip it to skip the stoplights, and they take my road down to then catch up on 28. I really want to make sure I understand these package options and I'm not sure if I will be able to make the meeting but I definitely want my voice to be heard. Thank you.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment. In the event you cannot make it to one of the scheduled public information meetings (PIMs), the presentation will be recorded and posted on the study website as part of the virtual PIM. The virtual PIM will be available on the study website through the public comment period, which extends through December 13, 2024. After that time, the PIM presentation and exhibits will be posted on the study website for future reference ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/us-31-south/">https://propelus31.com/us-31-south/</a> ).  At Division Road, the Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration include RCIs (Packages 1 and 3) and interchanges (Packages 4 and 6). The interactive map on the study website ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/">https://propelus31.com/</a> ) includes several videos that may be helpful to understand the improvement packages, as well as how the RCIs and the interchanges would work.
64	11/14/2024	Overall US 31 Corridor	Tipton - Division Rd	The stop light at 31 and division road needs to be removed. This is dangerous with cars running the light. Until it's removed, it needs a longer pause on yellow and then red before changing to green to allow cars who are running a chance to get though before other cars enter intersection	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would not include traffic signals at Division Road.
65	11/14/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	We need access to 31 from Division Road. I live in the area & work in Carmel. I also drive to Kokomo frequently for grocery needs. More importantly I want emergency vehicles to have access to our side of the county.	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements maintain access to/from US 31 from Division Road.
66	11/14/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	Of the packages that were recommended...what I like most/what I like least is: Package 4, full interchange at Division Road  Of the packages that were carried forward...what I like most/what I like least is: Package 1  Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the	All of the improvement packages you discussed in your comment (Packages 1 and 4) will be carried forward for consideration.  Based on public comment and coordination with study stakeholders, such as schools, emergency service providers and the local agricultural industry, the study team identified important crossings and access points. This information can be found in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Purpose and Need Report</i> found on the study website ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a> ). This

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				packages? Be sure to consider emergency vehicles and large farm equipment crossing US 31	information was considered by the study team throughout the development and evaluation of alternatives. Emergency services and local farm bureaus have been coordinated throughout the study.
67	11/14/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: 4, NOW  Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: Time frame  Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Prioritize 31 and Division first	Improvement Package 4 will be carried forward for consideration.  After the PEL study is complete, improvements carried forward from the study will be considered by INDOT as part of their traditional programming and project development processes. INDOT uses an objective, needs-based approach for new programming projects, so areas of highest need are addressed as funding is available. This process, which is known as the call for projects, is typically a five-year timeline.
68	11/14/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: Package 4 Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: J turns Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Keep Division open for ambulance/fire service	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would keep Division Road open for emergency service providers.  A “J-Turn” is one of several alternatives that fall within the family of Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs). Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>• The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.
69	11/14/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: Package 4 Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Change constant yield sign at Division	Improvement Package 4 will be carried forward for further consideration.  None of the Improvement Packages considered in the Tipton Planning Segment would include traffic signals at Division Road.
70	11/14/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: 4 needs prioritized, Division Road	Improvement Package 4 will be carried forward for further consideration.

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Division Road is dangerous. Save lives and prioritize it!	After the PEL study is complete, improvements carried forward from the study will be considered by INDOT as part of their traditional programming and project development processes. INDOT uses an objective, needs-based approach for new programming projects, so areas of highest need are addressed as funding is available. This process, which is known as the call for projects, is typically a five-year timeline.
71	11/14/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: Package 4 for Division Road is great and desperately needed  Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Package four gives better access to emergency vehicles if needed	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would provide access and cross-corridor mobility for emergency service providers.
72	11/14/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: #4 keeps access to Division Road and the right on, right off at 100N  Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Something needs to change. People run the red light all of the time. Accidents and deaths are going to continue to happen. But access to Division needs to keep access. There needs to be more than one intersection in Tipton. Plus emergency vehicles could access 31 and Division Road	Maximizing the safety of our roads is a priority for INDOT. Current and projected (i.e., year 2045) roadway operating conditions were analyzed as part of the study. This information can be found in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Existing Transportation Conditions Report</i> , which is available on the study website ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a> ). Based on the analysis, safety was identified as a concern throughout the study area. As a result, the study team evaluated alternatives to improve safety along US 31 by reducing the number and severity of crashes in the study area.  The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would provide access and cross-corridor mobility for emergency service providers. They would also improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes.
73	11/14/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: We want package 4, ESP Division	Improvement Package 4 will be carried forward for further consideration.
74	11/14/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: 4, keeps access to Division  Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? How many more accidents/deaths have to happen before something is done? No one stops even when the light is red and semis blow through the light all the time. Also please ask out loud "how many of you have almost been hit at Division and 31?" How many have accidents? How many accidents have you seen there? How many times have you seen an accident there?"	Improvement Package 4 will be carried forward for further consideration.  Maximizing the safety of our roads is a priority for INDOT. Current and projected (i.e., year 2045) roadway operating conditions were analyzed as part of the study. This information can be found in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Existing Transportation Conditions Report</i> , which is available on the study website ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a> ). Based on the analysis, safety was identified as a concern throughout the study area. As a result, the study team evaluated alternatives to improve safety along US 31 by reducing the number and severity of crashes in the study area.  The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes.
75	11/14/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: The Division interchange is best for trucks on this one--If ramps, not	Improvement Packages 4, 5, and 6 includes quadrant interchanges at the US 31/Division Road intersection. Improvement Packages 4 and 6 will be carried forward for further consideration.

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				<p>trucks. Tipton city needs to keep trucks off of 28. reduce speeding and heavy trucks through the city</p> <p>Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: Note, cannot do a Michigan left when speed is 60-70 mph. Per the video, right hand turns don't work for the semis</p> <p>Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Currently, signal directing trucks coming from North on 31 is poor. Truck info sign is behind speed limit sign. Ramp for Tipton is VERY FAST and has no runway for exit. All the new ramps are very long. Tipton needs a bypass from Division + 19 to meet up with east 28 bound past the city allowing truck traffic a through way.</p>	<p>None of the Improvement Packages considered in the Tipton Planning Segment would include traffic signals at Division Road.</p> <p>A "Michigan Left" is one of several alternatives that fall within the family of Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs). Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>• The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p> <p>The ProPEL US 31 South study is focused on identifying potential improvements to US 31 to address safety, access, and mobility needs. A bypass was analyzed as part of the <i>Final Universe of Alternatives (Level 1) Screening Report</i> (<a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a>). The Bypass Alternative was dismissed for further consideration as it is not practical based on its extraordinarily high cost of construction, the expected environmental impacts, and because it is not appropriate in scope and scale.</p>
76	11/14/2024		Tipton - General	<p>Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? I think there needs to be an immediate, temporary fix. There are way too many accidents currently. At minimum the turning signals need to be addressed. The turning signal only turns red and yellow, never green</p>	<p>Maximizing the safety of our roads is a priority for INDOT. Current and projected (i.e., year 2045) roadway operating conditions were analyzed as part of the study. This information can be found in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Existing Transportation Conditions Report</i>, which is available on the study website (<a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a>). Based on the analysis, safety was identified as a concern throughout the study area. As a result, the study team evaluated alternatives to improve safety along US 31 by reducing the number and severity of crashes in the study area.</p> <p>After the PEL study is complete, improvements carried forward from the study will be considered by INDOT as part of their traditional programming and project development processes. INDOT uses an objective, needs-based approach for new programming projects, so areas of highest need are addressed as funding is available. This process, which is known as the call for projects, is typically a five-year timeline.</p>
77	11/14/2024		Tipton - General	<p>Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: I like package 4 for Division Road but want Directional for 100N</p>	<p>Improvement Package 4 will be carried forward for further consideration.</p> <p>A directional median opening is included in Improvement Packages 3, which will also be carried forward for further consideration.</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					As noted in the <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i> , Improvement Packages are not intended to be completely rigid and improvements from different packages could be mixed and matched in future studies. This means that a directional median opening at CR 100 N could be considered as part of other Improvement Packages in the future – provided it is consistent and compatible with other potential improvements at nearby intersections.
78	11/14/2024		Tipton - General	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: #4 like most. Safer and access keeping driveways. #1 like least. Very dangerous! How many more accidents do we need?  Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Something needs to be done immediately and yesterday about the yellow turn arrow that does not turn green! ASAP	Improvement Packages 1 and 4 will be carried forward for further consideration.  The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. Additionally, none of the Improvement Packages considered in the Tipton Planning Segment would include traffic signals at Division Road.  Thank you for the information regarding prioritization. After the PEL study is complete, improvements carried forward from the study will be considered by INDOT as part of their traditional programming and project development processes. INDOT uses an objective, needs-based approach for new programming projects, so areas of highest need are addressed as funding is available. This process, which is known as the call for projects, is typically a five-year timeline.
79	11/14/2024		Tipton - General	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: Concerns about farm machinery in RCI solution. Length and width as well as mixing of speed is a concern	Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>• The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.
80	11/14/2024		Tipton - General	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: #4 needs to happen	Improvement Package 4 will be carried forward for further consideration.
81	11/14/2024		Tipton - General	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: Package 4! As my best friend almost died I want something to be done now. Quit bullsh****ing and prioritize what needs fixed first ."	Improvement Package 4 will be carried forward for further consideration.  After the PEL study is complete, improvements carried forward from the study will be considered by INDOT as part of their traditional programming and project development processes. INDOT

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					uses an objective, needs-based approach for new programming projects, so areas of highest need are addressed as funding is available. This process, which is known as the call for projects, is typically a five-year timeline.
82	11/15/2024	Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor, Draft Level 3 Report	Tipton - Division Rd	For the Division Rd. intersection in Tipton Co., we would prefer the Package 4 from the draft level 3 report. However, we would also prefer it to be a little north of the current intersection so that it wouldn't affect our house, which is the first house south of Division Rd. When will the final decision be made for this intersection, and will we homeowners be notified, either by mail or email?	<p>Improvement Package 4 will be carried forward for further consideration.</p> <p>The ProPEL US 31 South study is a planning study. No decisions have been made about the future of US 31, and no projects related to the PEL study have been funded by INDOT. At this time, there is no timeline for implementation of improvement projects associated with this study. Additionally, the exact locations and amounts of potential land acquisition (if required) have not been determined. This will require further study and additional detailed engineering work.</p> <p>As part of the study, avoidance and minimization of adverse impacts, such as those to existing homes and businesses, have been considered to the extent feasible in a planning study. These efforts will continue throughout the duration of the study, and will also be a focus of any subsequent project development activities, including the NEPA environmental review.</p> <p>After the PEL study is complete, improvements carried forward from the study will be considered by INDOT as part of their traditional programming and project development processes. INDOT uses an objective, needs-based approach for new programming projects, so areas of highest need are addressed as funding is available. This process, which is known as the call for projects, is typically a five-year timeline.</p>
83	11/16/2024	Safety	Tipton - CR 100 N	Tipton Planning Segment Improvement Packages: Please Consider Package 6 as there are deadly collisions at 100N. In my opinion either package 4 or 6 are far more beneficial to any other package.	All of the improvement packages you discussed in your comment (Packages 4 and 6) will be carried forward for consideration.
84	11/19/2024		Tipton - CR 100 N	Of the packages that were carried forward... What I like most is package 6 with regard to 100N. This is a quiet county road with a lot of wildlife from 31 heading east on 100N. This road does not go thru to SR19 so there isn't a ton of traffic because this road doesn't get you anywhere. We've had a fatality accident at the 31/100N intersection within the last few years. I walk my dogs on our road & go for jogs down our road. We have kids who ride their bicycles & dirt bikes down this road. I would love to see the access to 100N eliminated/the intersection closed for the safety of the residents who live down this stretch of county road.	<p>Improvement Package 6 will be carried forward for further consideration. CR 100 N would be closed as part of Improvement Package 6.</p> <p>As noted in the <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i>, Improvement Packages are not intended to be completely rigid and improvements from different packages could be mixed and matched in future studies. This means that a closure at CR 100 N could be considered as part of other Improvement Packages in the future – provided it is consistent and compatible with other potential improvements at nearby intersections.</p>
85	11/19/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: Division Road (least) Package 2-3 with reduced conflict intersections J turns.	<p>Improvement Package 2 will be eliminated from further consideration.</p> <p>The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include a Reduced Conflict Intersection (RCI) or a quadrant interchange at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes.</p> <p>"J-turns" are one of several alternatives that fall within the family of Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs). Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation phase, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					<p>concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p>
86	11/20/2024	Safety	Tipton - Division Rd	Please remove the dangerous stoplight on US 31 North of IN 28 known as division road	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include a Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCI) or a quadrant interchange at Division Road. These potential improvements would not include traffic signals.
87	11/23/2024	Mobility, Overall US 31 Corridor	Tipton - CR 100 N	I would like to see 100N in Tipton County maintain the ability to cross US31 and turn north or south. There is significant traffic on this road which leads to 800W and many homes along the route. It is also heavily used by the farming community.	<p>With the exception of Package 6, all of the Improvement Packages carried forward in the Tipton Planning Segment would maintain access to/from US 31 at CR 100 N. Improvement Package 1 would make no changes to this intersection. Improvement Package 3 would convert this intersection to a directional median opening. Improvement Package 4 would convert this intersection to a right-in/right-out only intersection.</p> <p>The loss of local access and cross-corridor mobility is an unavoidable impact when considering an upgrade to a higher-level facility. The study team attempted to identify a reasonable range of alternatives that balanced the identified safety, mobility and accessibility needs in the study area as well as the public and study stakeholder feedback. Due to its connectivity to Division Road to the south, the study team felt that safety could be improved by limiting crossing movements at the CR 100 N intersection. Additionally, it is important to note that Improvement Packages 3 and 4 would include properly designed median U-turn opening(s) at select locations to reduce how far drivers must travel when turning movements are limited to right-in/right-out and/or directional medians. The inclusion of the median U-turn openings would be limited and evaluated on a case-by-case basis in each planning segment based on access and safety considerations. This evaluation would occur during the project development process.</p>
88	11/27/2024		Tipton - General	Of the packages that were recommended... What I like most is package 4, without a doubt. Too many times in the last 40 years driving from Hamilton Co to Miami Co to go to work have I witnessed accidents and vehicles (including Semi tractors) blow right through the light at Division Rd. That light has to be eliminated. Package 4 makes the most sense. What I like least is the concept in package 3. I'm not sure the concept is safer at the Division Rd or W100N intersections. I still see risks of	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. Additionally, none of the Improvement Packages considered in the Tipton Planning Segment would include traffic signals at Division Road.

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				<p>accidents at both intersections with this concept. Also, during harvest season this will be an issue.</p> <p>Of the packages that were carried forward... What I like most is not really much. Both concepts don't take much danger out of the Division Rd and W100N intersections. What I like least is the concepts at both intersections as describe above.</p> <p>Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Having driven US 31 for 40 years from Hamilton Co to Miami Co, basically every day for work, I've seen plenty of changes and this is a long overdue change based on my experience and witnessing several accidents at these intersections and others up and down US31. For this section of the PROPEL project needs to be package 4. All of the changes that have happened from 276 Street south have been fabulous. I would hate to see it not continue for this entire project.</p>	
89	11/30/2024	Safety	Tipton - Division Rd	31 and division road Tipton County is an accident waiting to happen and it does often. I understand it is 100% driver fault for their errors in judgment or in inattention.	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes.
90	12/3/2024	Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor	Tipton - Division Rd	I believe a reduced conflict intersection will cause more issues at Division Rd and US 31 in Tipton County. Being a local resident, I believe the safest intersection would be a. Overpass with roundabouts like the US 31 / SR 28 interchange. While more expensive, it will be safer for the long term.	<p>The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes.</p> <p>Please note that all interchange concepts considered at Division Road would be quadrant interchanges. As noted in the <i>Final Level 2 Screening Report</i>, the quadrant interchange is a variation of the folded diamond interchange. It replaces the merge and diverge conditions at the ends of the ramps with right-in/right-out configurations, which often results in a lower-cost solution than a traditional interchange and can provide operational and safety conditions similar to those of a folded diamond interchange. A quadrant interchange configuration was also required to achieve the interchange spacing guidelines considered as part of the study.</p> <p>Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation phase, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> </ul>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p>
91	12/3/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	Division Rd should be removed from the US 31 Propels study. A Reduced Conflict Intersection at 31/Division Rd will create a high risk of an accident, especially when crossing with large farm equipment. This will only be compounded when county road intersections will be closed from crossing of US 31. It will force all farmers to use this type of crossing.	<p>The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes.</p> <p>Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation phase, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p>
92	12/3/2024	Overall US 31 Corridor	Tipton - Division Rd	The "J" turn, Michigan left idea at 31 & division road is a BAD idea. I use division road to 31 everyday for work. Leave the light or make an interchange with on and off ramps.	<p>Please note that none of the Improvement Packages considered in the Tipton Planning Segment would include traffic signals at Division Road. Improvement Packages 4, 5, and 6 would include quadrant interchanges at Division Road.</p> <p>"J-turns" are one of several alternatives that fall within the family of Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs). Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation phase, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> </ul>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p>
93	12/3/2024	Mobility, Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor	Tipton - Division Rd	A Reduced Conflict Intersection at US 31 and Division Road in Tipton County is not a viable solution for our county's rural residents trying to move farm equipment, grain/semi trucks, or livestock trailers across US 31. This is already a very dangerous intersection and this type of approach will do nothing to help that. With commercial truck traffic now being routed to Division Road as well (truck traffic is no longer allowed on State Road 28 through the city of Tipton), an overpass at US 31 and Division makes much more sense. Additionally, as county roads are shut down to make US 31 limited access, our county needs more than one overpass to ensure the western side of our county has ample access to emergency services in town.	<p>The ProPEL US 31 South study is a planning study. No decisions have been made about the future of US 31, and no projects related to the PEL study have been funded by INDOT. At this time, there is no timeline for implementation of improvement projects associated with this study.</p> <p>At Division Road, the Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration include RCIs (Packages 1 and 3) and interchanges (Packages 4 and 6).</p> <p>Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation phase, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p> <p>Tipton County includes three planning segments: Sharpsville, Tipton, and East Union. In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i>, overpasses have been added at CR 300 N (Sharpsville Planning Segment) and CR 500 S (in the East Union Planning Segment). These overpasses are contained in multiple Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration.</p>
94	12/3/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	This is way more dangerous than what we have now. Cars having to turn right (northbound) to jump 2 lanes of traffic to get to a turn around all without the northbound traffic having to stop. Same way southbound. This solves NOTHING ! It will need to be an overpass just like Bakers corner. SR 28 & also 276th street is too involved. Simple on and off ramps.	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes.
95	12/3/2024	Mobility, Safety, Overall US 31	Tipton - General	I would like to leave comments about the segments. I think there are three segments in Tipton County. I am a farmer and we do farm ground on both sides of Tipton County like most farmers that are in Tipton County	Based on public comment and coordination with study stakeholders, such as schools, emergency service providers and the local agricultural industry, the study team identified important crossings and access points. This information can be found in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Purpose</i>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
		Corridor, Draft Level 3 Report		<p>that are on the west side. My concern is that the capacity of farm equipment during the busy time of the year, spring and fall, to get equipment across 31. I know there is at least one if not two RCIs, reduced conflict intersections that are being proposed on these segments and I am concerned with the capacity of multiple farmers crossing two sets of lanes into the J-turn, and then crossing two more sets of lanes. We do that today it takes sometimes 10, 15 minutes to cross those lanes just because of the traffic volume. I think we will be causing traffic issues on, for example, Davison Road trying to cross there if other cars are waiting on us to cross those lanes. I think we will be causing traffic congestion. Those could be school buses, those could be cars, those could be semis that are waiting on us. And there could be multiple agricultural equipment waiting to cross that intersection during busy times of the year. Our ag equipment is easily 20 feet wide, if not wider in some instances. So, I am concerned that even if we start to get into the RCI, in the middle or what it turns around, that we'll still be hanging out into oncoming traffic or coming traffic behind us, and causing a potential traffic hazard on US 31 using these RCIs</p> <p>It is my opinion that we need to have at least overpasses to get our farm equipment across the road because if we start to close crossings across the road at these different intersections like 200, 300 you're going to be forcing farm equipment down to these places you can cross and it's just going to become a traffic congestion by doing that. So, that is my concern. My concern is getting farm equipment from one side of US 31 to the other side of US 31. We are not wanting to get the farm equipment on the road on US 31 and I'm afraid these RCIs will cause us to do that and potentially causing traffic issues on US 31 and traffic issues on other roads like Division for traffic waiting on us. Thank you.</p>	<p><i>and Need Report</i> found on the study website (<a href="https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/">https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/</a>). This information was considered by the study team throughout the development and evaluation of alternatives.</p> <p>The loss of local access and cross-corridor mobility is an unavoidable impact when considering an upgrade to a higher-level facility. The study team attempted to identify a reasonable range of alternatives that balanced the identified safety, mobility and accessibility needs in the study area as well as the public and study stakeholder feedback.</p> <p>Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation phase, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>• The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p> <p>Tipton County includes three planning segments: Sharpville, Tipton, and East Union. In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i>, overpass have been added at CR 300 N (Sharpville Planning Segment) and CR 500 S (in the East Union Planning Segment). These overpasses are contained in multiple Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration.</p>
96	12/3/2024		Tipton - General	<p>I understand the need for a quicker travel down 31, however you're forgetting the farmers and people that live in rural Tipton County that still need to cross the highway.</p>	<p>Based on public comment and coordination with study stakeholders, such as schools, emergency service providers and the local agricultural industry, the study team identified important crossings and access points. This information can be found in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Purpose and Need Report</i> found on the study website (<a href="https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/">https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/</a>). This information was considered by the study team throughout the development and evaluation of alternatives.</p> <p>The loss of local access and cross-corridor mobility is an unavoidable impact when considering an upgrade to a higher-level facility. The study team attempted to identify a reasonable range of alternatives that balanced the identified safety, mobility and accessibility needs in the study area as well as the public and study stakeholder feedback.</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
97	12/3/2024	Mobility, Safety, Draft Level 3 Report	Tipton - General	Viewing the proposed plans throughout the Tipton county's segment it is concerning that there aren't enough overpasses for east-west traffic in the northern or southern areas. I believe funneling all the east- west traffic in the northern area to 600N and funneling all the southern traffic to Division road will cause local safety problem.	Tipton County includes three planning segments: Sharpsville, Tipton, and East Union. In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i> , overpass have been added at CR 300 N (Sharpsville Planning Segment) and CR 500 S (in the East Union Planning Segment). These overpasses are contained in multiple Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration.
98	12/4/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	New road paths must include the function of the intersection. The proposed intersection does not include the high value function of the immediate agriculture community to cross these roads. Therefore, the proposed intersection should be changed to include ALL major functions of the intersection.	<p>This comment is associated with a pin placed on the online map at the intersection of US 31/Division Road in the Tipton Planning Segment.</p> <p>The packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and interchanges at this intersection. Both improvement alternatives would safely accommodate farming equipment.</p> <p>Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>• The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p>
99	12/5/2024	Mobility, Safety	Tipton - Division Rd	Needs to be an overpass over division. Too many accidents. But needs to be access because there are many semis that use this road.	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes.
100	12/5/2024	Economic Development, Mobility, Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor	Tipton - Division Rd	I think that an interchange at US31 and Division Road in Tipton County is essential for the safety, mobility, and vibrance of the community in this area, particularly West of US 31. Division Road in Tipton County is a mainstay of agricultural traffic (both tractor and semi-truck). Part of this stems from making Division Road THE Truck Route to bypass the City of Tipton. Why not continue this effort by allowing truck traffic to cross US31 unimpeded and allow access to this major North/South corridor from a major East/West corridor in the county?	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes.

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
101	12/5/2024	Overall US 31 Corridor	Tipton - Division Rd	I don't understand why INDOT and the state government officials refuse to listen to the people who live and work in Tipton County. We NEED the intersection of US 31 and Division Rd to be accessible to ALL vehicles, including semi trucks and farm equipment. My husband and I have lived in Tipton county for over 30 years and we commute an hour to Indianapolis for work and use this intersection every day on our commute. Changing this intersection into a Michigan u-turn will cause many more accidents. Anyone having to having to turn onto 31 will have to turn right and then make a u-turn?? And at the same time, cross two lanes of traffic going 60-70 MPH without getting hit?? How is this a good idea?? Why would anyone think this is smart? What we need is an overpass. A normal overpass without round-about so semi-trucks and combines and tractors pulling farm equipment can navigate the overpass easily. An overpass with on and off ramps so those of us who live here can access Division Rd easily, without having to drive miles out of our way and go around Robin Hood's barn to get home. And why is it so important to close off most of the county roads?? How are emergency vehicles supposed to cross US31 to get to western Tipton county? What if a person's house is on fire?? Or someone is having a heart attack and they live in the western part of Tipton county and emergency vehicles can't get there in a timely manner? Sorry about your luck?? PLEASE stop the bureaucracy and the madness and LISTEN to those of us that actually live here.	<p>The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.</p> <p>Based on public comment and coordination with study stakeholders, such as schools, emergency service providers and the local agricultural industry, the study team identified important crossings and access points. This information can be found in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Purpose and Need Report</i> found on the study website (<a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a>). This information was considered by the study team throughout the development and evaluation of alternatives.</p> <p>The loss of local access and cross-corridor mobility is an unavoidable impact when considering an upgrade to a higher-level facility. The study team attempted to identify a reasonable range of alternatives that balanced the identified safety, mobility and accessibility needs in the study area as well as the public and study stakeholder feedback.</p> <p>Tipton County includes three planning segments: Sharpsville, Tipton, and East Union. In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i>, overpass have been added at CR 300 N (Sharpsville Planning Segment) and CR 500 S (in the East Union Planning Segment). These overpasses are contained in multiple Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration.</p>
102	12/5/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	We need an exit ramp or overpass at Division Road and 31	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.
103	12/5/2024	Overall US 31 Corridor	Tipton - Division Rd	We need a full interchange at 31 & Division. I've lived here 53 years and what is proposed is going to increase the death toll. Overpass with exits .	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes.
104	12/5/2024	Environmental, Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor	Tipton - Division Rd	The proposed project at Division Rd and 31 in Tipton county needs to be a full interchange or better yet an overpass. This other nonsense that is being proposed is ridiculous and shouldn't even be considered. You folks that are making these plans and decisions don't live or drive this area frequently obviously. The intersection currently as is, is NOT an issue except for people who RUN the RED lights, causing problems. I've NEVER had a problem with this intersection and I drive it frequently going to Noblesville. An overpass would be the best solution for all involved. We are a FARMING community which means a LOT of farm equipment travels	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				on these county roads to provide FOOD for YOUR families. They need to be able to have non obstructed access to cross the highway, which the overpass would provide without interrupting highway traffic which averages a speed of 70 mph.	
105	12/5/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	Tipton county: division road and 31 not having lights or a round about is a safety hazard. With traffic, farm equipment, semis and buses wrecks with be a tremendous hazard.	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.
106	12/6/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	As a resident on the west side of US31, living on Division Road. I feel that the safest option and best traffic flow is to have an interchange at Division and 31, no less than an over pass. The option now being proposed is dangerous for the amount of traffic that would be coming on and off along with the traffic that is extremely heavy on 31! Thank you.	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.
107	12/6/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	The Michigan left proposed at US31 and division road in Tipton county is unsafe and will put the livelihood of farmers who need to safely cross the road at risk.	<p>The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.</p> <p>A “Michigan Left” is one of several alternatives that fall within the family of Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs). Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>• The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
108	12/6/2024	Overall US 31 Corridor	Tipton - Division Rd	I would like to see a full interchange at 31 and Division in Tipton County.	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.
109	12/6/2024	Overall US 31 Corridor	Tipton - Division Rd	There needs to be an interchange at Division and 31 for travel safety for farmers and all of Tipton Co as an safe off and on to 31 north and south	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.
110	12/6/2024	Safety	Tipton - Division Rd	Please build an overpass it would be so much easier to cross & far less dangerous. You've done it on almost every single cross road on 31, one more isn't going to hurt ;) makes driving 31 a little more bearable	This comment is associated with a pin placed on the online map at the intersection of US 31/Division Road in the Tipton Planning Segment.  Due to the importance of maintaining access to/from US 31, an overpass was not considered at this location. The packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and interchanges at this intersection. Both improvement alternatives would make it safer to cross US 31.
111	12/6/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	This design is unsafe and inadequate for a farming community.	This comment is associated with a pin placed on the online map at the intersection of US 31/Division Road in the Tipton Planning Segment. It is not clear, however, what concept design or Improvement Package the comment is referencing.  The packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and interchanges at this intersection. Both improvement alternatives would safely accommodate farming equipment.  Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>• The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul>
112	12/8/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	I believe the current proposition to US31 and division rd is a terrible oversite and decision. Am alternative to the proposed Reduced Conflict	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				Intersection is a full interchange or overpass at US 31 and Division Road in Tipton. We believe these options would be more effective in addressing the needs of our farming community and citizens.	interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.
113	12/9/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	I have been to several of your meetings here in Tipton and the last one was looking at the interchange at Division Road and 31. That interchange with the pass over, I think it is number four segment or whatever, expressway lite, foreflow. For farm equipment, that is a workable interchange, but the one picture I'd seen where they, you kinda go north then go up a ways and make a J hook and come back, with our large farm equipment and long things, that's an absolute disaster. Like I say, with farms we got semi-trucks making a turn like that to go back the other way is accidents waiting to happen. My opinion, that's a dangerous alternative. So, I hope that if you do anything there and change it from the light, you at least go with the one that looks like a D or something to the north. That's my comment. Thank you.	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.
114	12/11/2024		Tipton - Division Rd	Of the packages that were recommended... What I like most is package 3 What I like least is packed 4. I didn't see a way to turn south on 31 when heading west on deviation rd  Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? I need to be able to access all directions at deviation Rd intersection with a 50' vehicle safely	Improvement Package 4 would include a quadrant interchange at Division Road. A quadrant interchange would allow traffic traveling west on Division Road to turn south on US 31. The interactive map on the study website ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/">https://propelus31.com/</a> ) includes several videos that may be helpful to understand how the quadrant interchange in Package 4 would work.  The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.
115	12/12/2024	Safety, Draft Level 3 Report	Tipton - Division Rd	Package 3 for the Tipton Planning Segment from my perspective, is not a good alternative for Division Road. The Reduced Conflict Intersection at this location does not provide enough consideration for slower moving Farm equipment and semi-trucks that must enter US31 from Division Road. I feel this alternative will still cause many accidents at Division Road and thus will not address the safety concerns that are trying to be eliminate or greatly reduced at Division Road.	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.  Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> </ul>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p>
116	12/12/2024	Safety	Tipton - Division Rd	Why would you consider a Michigan left at division in Tipton county, how many people will have to die before it is changed? You really need to put in right turn lanes at the county roads then leave it alone	The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.
117	12/12/2024	Draft Level 3 Report	Tipton - General	Package 4 appears to be the best alternative for the Tipton Planning Segment compared to the other Packages for this segment. Though it would have been preferred to have on and off ramps as part of this Interchange overpass option as was done at SR28, I suspect that the cost of this was substantially more than the Interchange option shown in Package 4. I feel Package 4 will receive the most support from the Tipton County community as a whole.	Please note that all interchange concepts considered at Division Road would be quadrant interchanges. As noted in the <i>Final Level 2 Screening Report</i> , the quadrant interchange is a variation of the folded diamond interchange. It replaces the merge and diverge conditions at the ends of the ramps with right-in/right-out configurations, which often results in a lower-cost solution than a traditional interchange and can provide operational and safety conditions similar to those of a folded diamond interchange. A quadrant interchange configuration was also required to achieve the interchange spacing guidelines considered as part of the study.
118	12/13/2024	Safety	Tipton - Division Rd	I am concerned about the Division Road plan in Tipton County for a reduced conflict intersection. I travel US 31 N to Division Road, turning west every day to work. It is almost impossible to cross the southbound lanes without the green arrow due to the heavy flow of traffic. The same, returning home and turning right off of Division Road. I cannot see how making a reduced conflict intersection would be safe. Many semi's turn east and west on Division from US 31 daily. To have them cross into the left hand lanes and make a U turn across an existing narrow median into a flow of traffic, seems extremely dangerous. Division Road need a full interchange.	<p>The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.</p> <p>Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.
119	12/13/2024	Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor	Tipton - Division Rd	I am strongly against a reduced conflict intersection at Division Road and US 31. I am an owner of Total Seed Production located 2 miles west of 31 and 1 1/4 mile north of Division Road. We have over 5,000 semis coming off of 31 during the normal work hours a year Scircleville Co-op and Nutrien Ag Services also have many semis using Division Road.. To have that many semis trying to make a turn across oncoming traffic is an accident waiting to happen. We also farm on both sides of US 31. Our equipment is very large and would pose a safety hazard as well. Division Road needs a full intersection...no question about it!	<p>The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.</p> <p>Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>• The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p>
120	12/13/2024	Economic Development, Mobility, Safety, Draft Level 3 Report	Tipton - Division Rd	The rci proposal in option 3 will create extremely dangerous conditions when attempting to cross 31 on division with semis and farm equipment. They are too slow and wide to cross 2 lanes of moving traffic then turn 180 degrees and cross 2 more lanes of traffic. Please remove this option from the final report.	<p>The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.</p> <p>Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> </ul>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p>
121	12/13/2024	Economic Development, Environmental, Mobility, Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor	Tipton - Division Rd	<p>I am writing to express my strong support for the establishment of a full interchange at the intersection of Division and US 31. The current infrastructure poses significant safety challenges for drivers and limits access to essential services in the area. Safety Concerns: The lack of a full interchange increases the risk of accidents and complicates traffic flow, especially during peak hours. A full interchange would facilitate safer merging and turning movements, significantly reducing the potential for collisions. Economic Growth: For businesses located on the west side of US 31, safe and direct access is crucial for their success. A full interchange would enhance accessibility, encouraging more traffic to local businesses and fostering economic growth. In turn, this would lead to job creation and increased revenue for the community. Emergency Vehicle Access: Another critical consideration is emergency response. The existing limitation of access solely via State Road 28 can delay emergency vehicles in critical situations. A full interchange would ensure that first responders can swiftly reach the western part of Tipton County, potentially saving lives and ensuring public safety during emergencies. In conclusion, the implementation of a full interchange at Division and US 31 is imperative for both driver safety and the economic vitality of our community. The current access points do not sufficiently meet the needs of residents, businesses, and emergency services. I urge you to prioritize this project for the benefit of all stakeholders involved. Thank you for considering this vital development.</p>	<p>The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.</p> <p>Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p> <p>After the PEL study is complete, improvements carried forward from the study will be considered by INDOT as part of their traditional programming and project development processes. INDOT uses an objective, needs-based approach for new programming projects, so areas of highest need are addressed as funding is available. This process, which is known as the call for projects, is typically a five-year timeline.</p>
122	12/14/2024	Mobility, Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor	Tipton - Division Rd	<p>I work on a farm and 31 and division is a major crossing point for farm equipment. I have concerns with putting J turns in as this would make us having to travel on 31 and crossing all lanes of traffic. I would like to see a overpass with ramps entering and exiting as we also have alot of semi traffic coming in making delivery and hauling out also.</p>	<p>The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. These potential improvements would also provide access and cross-corridor mobility for roadway users, including emergency service providers and farm equipment.</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					<p>Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>• The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p>
123	11/13/2024	Overall US 31 Corridor	East Union - General	What about the southern half of US31 in Tipton County! Is there any over passes to be built in the southern section south of SR.28?	In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i> , an overpass has been added at County Road West 500 South (in the East Union Planning Segment) to each Improvement Package carried forward for further consideration (Packages 2, 3, and 5).
124	11/14/2024	Safety	East Union - General	Ideally, W350S would be closed off to US 31. We would like the blind curb at 28 and S725W to be made safer.	<p>Improvement Packages 2, 3, and 5 will be carried forward for further consideration. CR 350 S would be closed as part of Improvement Package 5.</p> <p>As noted in the <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i>, Improvement Packages are not intended to be completely rigid and improvements from different packages could be mixed and matched in future studies. This means that a closure at CR 350 S could be considered as part of other Improvement Packages in the future – provided it is consistent and compatible with other potential improvements at nearby intersections.</p> <p>The intersection of SR 28 and CR S725W is outside the ProPEL US 31 South study area. Therefore, it was not considered as part of the study.</p>
125	11/14/2024	Safety, Draft Level 3 Report	East Union - 296th St	No Michigan Lefts,Traffic to HEAVY How will semis handle them INTERCHANGES PLEASE 296 STREET	<p>A minimum interchange spacing of 3 miles was used in this study. Due to its proximity to the existing interchange at 276th Street and the interchange spacing guidelines considered in this study, an interchange was not evaluated at 296th Street.</p> <p>A “Michigan Left” is one of several alternatives that fall within the family of Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs). Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate</li> </ul>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					<p>semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>• The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p>
126	11/14/2024		East Union - 296th St	I own property between 286 and 296th. Looking at economic dev I would like to keep the property to start a business. I'm not interested in selling it. I really don't want to lose my home.	<p>The ProPEL US 31 South study is a planning study. No decisions have been made about the future of US 31, and no projects related to the PEL study have been funded by INDOT. At this time, there is no timeline for implementation of improvement projects associated with this study. Additionally, the exact locations and amounts of potential land acquisition (if required) have not been determined. This will require further study and additional detailed engineering work.</p> <p>The study team has noted your comment regarding the Improvement Packages for the East Union Planning Segment and it has been documented as part of the official study record.</p> <p>In the East Union Planning Segment, Package 5 is carried forward for further consideration. Although Package 3 does not contain an RCI, Package 2 does include an RCI at 296th Street and is carried forward for further consideration. As noted in the <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i>, Improvement Packages are not intended to be completely rigid and improvements from different packages could be mixed and matched in future studies. This means that an RCI at 296th Street could be considered in the future – provided it is consistent and compatible with other potential improvements at nearby intersections.</p>
127	11/14/2024		East Union - 296th St	Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? I would like to retain my property on US 31, South 296th.	<p>The ProPEL US 31 South study is a planning study. No decisions have been made about the future of US 31, and no projects related to the PEL study have been funded by INDOT. At this time, there is no timeline for implementation of improvement projects associated with this study. Additionally, the exact locations and amounts of potential land acquisition (if required) have not been determined. This will require further study and additional detailed engineering work.</p>
128	11/14/2024	Draft Level 3 Report	East Union - 296th St	The state INDOT website has a 3 minute video in regards to 296th street. One option is an interchange. Is that still an option?	<p>Although an interchange alternative for the 296th Street intersection passed the Level 2 screening, it was eliminated from further consideration in the Level 3 screening due to interchange spacing guidelines. This intersection is in a rural area. Therefore, it would be too close to the existing interchange at 276th Street (approximately 1.9 miles). For these reasons, an interchange alternative at 296th Street was not included as part of the Improvement Packages for the East Union Planning Segment. Please see the <i>Final Level 3 Screening Report</i> for further information.</p>
129	11/14/2024		East Union - CR 500 S	Concerning south of SR 28; 500S is where we would like to see an overpass if possible for farm equipment and emergency vehicles. The reason 500S is because it's a longer and unobstructed road compared to the others. It's	<p>In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i>, an overpass has been added at County Road West 500 South (in the East Union Planning Segment) to each Improvement Package carried forward for further consideration (Packages 2, 3, and 5).</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				inconvenient to go up to SR 28 because it's out of the way; not to mention using the roundabouts for farm equipment is difficult.	
130	11/14/2024		East Union - CR 500 S	On the East Union section. The fact there are no overpasses on the east union section make it difficult to get farm machinery across US 31 and 500S or 600S. The same thing would apply to the other section north of 100 N.	In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i> , an overpass has been added at County Road West 500 South (in the East Union Planning Segment) to each Improvement Package carried forward for further consideration (Packages 2, 3, and 5).
131	11/14/2024		East Union - General	<p>Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: #5, get rid of cross traffic BUT put an intersection at Union Street</p> <p>Of the packages that were carried forward what I like most/what I like least is: Package 3, no RCI</p> <p>Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Do not use reduced conflict intersections. Farm equipment can not do the turns with the traffic on 31</p>	<p>Improvement Package 5 (along with Packages 2 and 3) will be carried forward for consideration.</p> <p>Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>• The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p>
132	11/14/2024		East Union - General	Of the packages that were recommended what I like most/what I like least is: Package #2, like	<p>The study team has noted your comment in support of the free flow arterial Improvement Package, and it has been documented as part of the official study record.</p> <p>At this time, no decisions have been made about the future of US 31, and no projects related to the PEL study have been funded by INDOT.</p>
133	11/14/2024		East Union - General	Do you have other comments to share with the study team regarding the packages? Would like overpass between 276th and SR 28 interchanges	In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i> , an overpass has been added at County Road West 500 South (in the East Union Planning Segment) to each Improvement Package carried forward for further consideration (Packages 2, 3, and 5).
134	11/19/2024		East Union - 276th St	I'd like to learn the decision making process that went into the overpass, etc. for the Reynold equipment access ?	The recently constructed interchange at 276 <sup>th</sup> Street was built as part of a separate INDOT project.
135	11/23/2024	Overall US 31 Corridor	East Union - 286th St	286th should be closed. No access. It will not cause a problem for anyone living on that street. 276 is not that far away.	Package 5, which is carried forward for further consideration, would close 286 <sup>th</sup> Street. Packages 2, 3, and 4, which are also carried forward for further consideration would convert 286 <sup>th</sup> Street to a right-in/right-out intersection.

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
136	11/25/2024	Mobility, Safety	East Union - 296th St	Package 3 in the East Union segment will be a hardship on local residents as well as travelers on US 31 who need to make a left turn to reach local locations. This package would mean that to cross 31 drivers would be required to take county roads all the way to 276 th street or up to SR 28 to cross 31. This would include large slow farm traffic which would cause congestion on the round-a-bouts at US 31 and SR 28 which are already very busy with semi traffic from the Love's truck stop. The u turns required in package 2 will create an unsafe situation with slow farm traffic turning in front of high speed US 31 traffic just to get across US 31.	<p>The study team has noted your comment expressing concern with Package 3 and it has been documented as part of the official study record.</p> <p>The loss of local access and cross-corridor mobility is an unavoidable impact when considering an upgrade to a higher-level facility. The study team attempted to identify a reasonable range of alternatives that balanced the identified safety, mobility and accessibility needs in the study area as well as the public and study stakeholder feedback.</p> <p>As noted in the <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i>, the expressway lite facility type was developed in direct response to the public comments received throughout the study. Residents and other local stakeholders requested improved mobility through reduction or elimination of traffic signals without sacrificing accessibility to/from US 31. After considering these comments, the expressway lite facility type was developed to combine the driveway access aspects of arterial without signals (free flow) with the increased access management of expressway (free flow). Expressway lite, however, would have properly designed median U-turn opening(s) at select locations to reduce how far drivers must travel when turning movements are limited to right-in/right-out and/or directional medians. The inclusion of the median U-turn openings would be limited and evaluated on a case-by-case basis in each planning segment based on access and safety considerations. This evaluation would occur during the project development process.</p>
137	11/25/2024	Mobility, Safety, Draft Level 3 Report	East Union - General	For the East Union planning segment: Package #2 seems to be the best option for us. I also liked #3 but it seemed too restrictive on east/west access for, what appeared to me, minimal safety benefits. I'd love to see 286th Street closed entirely but the only package that includes that is far too restrictive on access. The other packages don't seem to provide enough access east and west, so my suggestion is #2.	<p>The study team has noted your comment in support of the free flow arterial Improvement Package, and it has been documented as part of the official study record.</p> <p>The loss of local access and cross-corridor mobility is an unavoidable impact when considering an upgrade to a higher-level facility, such as a freeway with full control of access. The study team attempted to identify a reasonable range of alternatives that balanced the identified safety, mobility and accessibility needs in the study area as well as the public and study stakeholder feedback.</p> <p>As noted in the <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i>, the expressway lite facility type was developed in direct response to the public comments received throughout the study. Residents and other local stakeholders requested improved mobility through reduction or elimination of traffic signals without sacrificing accessibility to/from US 31. After considering these comments, the expressway lite facility type was developed to combine the driveway access aspects of arterial without signals (free flow) with the increased access management of expressway (free flow).</p>
138	12/3/2024	Mobility, Safety	East Union - General	For the East Union portion, all roads should have cul-de-sacs and be closed off from 31. It is too dangerous to cross and scary to even turn right onto the highway at this point. You should carry out with package 5 as my best advice for someone that grew up on 600 S and lives on 500 S. Package 2 should be eliminated completely, as the reduced conflict intersection on 600 S would create traffic jams and increase risk of anyone trying to cross the two lanes of 31. Package 3 is the second best option, but many of these roads can access 28 or 276 to cross or reach either side of the highway just as easy. The most ideal situation would be an overpass on 600 S to mitigate anyone between 276 and 28 to cross over.	<p>The loss of local access and cross-corridor mobility is an unavoidable impact when considering an upgrade to a higher-level facility, such as a freeway facility with full control of access. The study team attempted to identify a reasonable range of alternatives that balanced the identified safety, mobility and accessibility needs in the study area as well as the public and study stakeholder feedback.</p> <p>As noted in the <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i>, the expressway lite facility type was developed in direct response to the public comments received throughout the study. Residents and other local stakeholders requested improved mobility through reduction or elimination of traffic signals without sacrificing accessibility to/from US 31. After considering these comments, the expressway lite facility type was developed to combine the driveway access aspects of arterial</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					<p>without signals (free flow) with the increased access management of expressway (free flow). Expressway lite, however, would have properly designed median U-turn opening(s) at select locations to reduce how far drivers must travel when turning movements are limited to right-in/right-out and/or directional medians. The inclusion of the median U-turn openings would be limited and evaluated on a case-by-case basis in each planning segment based on access and safety considerations. This evaluation would occur during the project development process.</p> <p>In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i>, an overpass has been added at County Road West 500 South (in the East Union Planning Segment) to each Improvement Package carried forward for further consideration (Packages 2, 3, and 5).</p>
139	12/5/2024	Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor, Draft Level 3 Report	East Union - 296th St	Proposal 5 for the east union portion of the US 31 project removing access to 296th is the safest and most logical. With the traffic patterns of US 31, it is too dangerous to cross, enter 31 or exit off from 296th/600 S. With exits close by at 276th and SR 28, it is very little inconvenience to use one of the already established exits that are not far out of the way from either direction	<p>The study team has noted your comment expressing support for Package 5, and it has been documented as part of the official study record.</p> <p>In response to public comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i>, an overpass has been added at County Road West 500 South (in the East Union Planning Segment) to each Improvement Package carried forward for further consideration (Packages 2, 3, and 5).</p>
140	12/6/2024	Bike and Pedestrian, Economic Development, Mobility, Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor, Draft Level 3 Report	East Union - 296th St	<p>The decision to remove an interchange option at US 31 and 296th street was a mistake. 296th street does provide access to the town of Atlanta like you described, but also to further towns such as Tipton, Frankton, Lapel, Arcadia and more. Take a look at how many big cities or towns are in close proximity to 296 street all the way to the east side of Indiana. Based on INDOTS own study numbers 296 th street and US 31 intersection has a higher AADT (1604) than 276 th currently does (1320) WITH an interchange. According to INDOT own numbers from May of 2023 to May of 2024 there was an 18% increase in traffic at 296. Its not uncommon at all to see 10 or more cars lined up on 296 street on the East and west side to try to enter or cross US 31 north or south. Couple that with the lack of breaks due to the stop lights being removed its makes for a very dangerous situation. Farm equipment is almost impossible to cross 31 and 296. No traffic breaks and the amount of extra crossing time due to long equipment lengths make for dangerous situations. RCI dont solve any problems I mentioned above specifically for farm equipment. RCI are in my opinion a waste of taxpayer money. Given the rapid growth from the south and the increased traffic from the east on 296, the RCI will soon also be operating at failing rate. So why not do it right the first time by putting an interchange in? Construction and land values only continue to increase so doing it right today will be much cheaper than correcting it in the future. Lastly one of the signs that were displayed at your Tipton meeting showed a walking path along 296 and crossing 31. How is that safe and would a RCI allow for this? Thank You</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment regarding improvement alternatives at 296<sup>th</sup> Street in the East Union Planning Segment.</p> <p>Although an interchange alternative for the 296th Street intersection passed the Level 2 screening, it was eliminated from further consideration in the Level 3 screening due to interchange spacing guidelines. This intersection is in a rural area. Therefore, it would be too close to the existing interchange at 276th Street (approximately 1.9 miles). For these reasons, an interchange alternative at 296th Street was not included as part of the Improvement Packages for the East Union Planning Segment.</p> <p>Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>• The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA and project development studies.</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					The study team is not considering or recommending a walking path along 296 <sup>th</sup> Street. As noted in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Environmental Constraints Report</i> ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a> ), that is a planned trail segment between Tipton County and Madison County.
141	11/13/2024		Overall Corridor	No j turns. No added traffic lights.	<p>The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the US 31 South study area would not add additional traffic signals to US 31.</p> <p>"J-turns" are one of several alternatives that fall within the family of Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs). Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation phase, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>• The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p>
142	11/14/2024	Overall US 31 Corridor	Overall Corridor	Too many accidents are happening here. Please help fix the problem.	Maximizing the safety of our roads is a priority for INDOT. Current and projected (i.e., year 2045) roadway operating conditions were analyzed as part of the study. This information can be found in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Existing Transportation Conditions Report</i> , which is available on the study website ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a> ). Based on the analysis, safety was identified as a concern throughout the study area. As a result, the study team evaluated alternatives to improve safety along US 31 by reducing the number and severity of crashes in the study area.
143	11/14/2024	Mobility, Overall US 31 Corridor, Draft Level 3 Report	Overall Corridor	The package that is the expressway with only access for on/off ramps should be completed. This will complete the expressway from SB to Indy that was initially proposed. This will allow a consistent speed all the way.	<p>The study team has noted your comment in support of the expressway improvement packages and it has been documented as part of the official study record.</p> <p>At this time, no decisions have been made about the future of US 31, and no projects related to the PEL study have been funded by INDOT.</p>
144	11/17/2024	Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor, Draft Level 3 Report	Overall Corridor	I found the Draft Level 3 Report to be a comprehensive analysis of the US 31 corridor. The study helps demonstrate there is no single solution optimizing US 31 design. Thank you to team representatives for the live	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment.

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				inperson overview of study and understanding of the packages. I found the overview informative, non-contentious and absence of local politics. Once the study is completed and released I am hopeful the critical safety improvements can be implemented before the study is deemed obsolete.	Please continue to check the website to stay informed about the study. Upcoming public meetings, community office hours, and additional study information will be posted on the study website when it is available ( <a href="http://www.propelUS31.com">www.propelUS31.com</a> ).
145	11/19/2024	Mobility, Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor, Draft Level 3 Report	Overall Corridor	Please reconsider hogtying local residents and their school buses, ambulances, and other emergency vehicles. Don't cheerfully add to our daily drive-times. We LIVE here; we are not just passing through. We need safe and efficient access.	<p>Thank you for your comment regarding the impacts to local access and cross-corridor mobility that would occur with implementing greater control of access in the study area.</p> <p>Based on public comment and coordination with study stakeholders, such as schools, emergency service providers and the local agricultural industry, the study team identified important crossings and access points. This information can be found in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Purpose and Need Report</i> found on the study website (<a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a>). This information was considered by the study team throughout the development and evaluation of alternatives.</p> <p>The loss of local access and cross-corridor mobility is an unavoidable impact when considering an upgrade to a higher-level facility, such as a freeway with full control of access. The study team attempted to identify a reasonable range of alternatives that balanced the identified safety, mobility and accessibility needs in the study area as well as the public and study stakeholder feedback.</p> <p>As noted in the <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i>, the expressway lite facility type was developed in direct response to the public comments received throughout the study. Residents and other local stakeholders requested improved mobility through reduction or elimination of traffic signals without sacrificing accessibility to/from US 31. After considering these comments, the expressway lite facility type was developed to combine the driveway access aspects of arterial without signals (free flow) with the increased access management of expressway (free flow).</p>
146	11/21/2024	Economic Development, Overall US 31 Corridor, Draft Level 3 Report	Not Specified	What are you thinking? This is helping who? Schools, medical vehicles, businessnesses! Plus state road has so much truck traffic. So north and south 31 I say NO THANK YOU!! Crazy thinking.	<p>The study team has noted your comment in support of the No-Build alternative for the study corridor, and it has been documented as part of the official study record.</p> <p>At this time, no decisions have been made about the future of US 31, and no projects related to the PEL study have been funded by INDOT.</p>
147	11/22/2024	Overall US 31 Corridor	Not Specified	Having no access onto 31 off of another highway is ridiculous. At least put a j turn in. How do you expect us to get to work. That is our only out let. I work in kokomo and you are going to make me go clear out of the way the oppisit direction to turn back around and back track to get to work.	<p>Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment. Unfortunately, it is unclear as to which planning segment or Improvement Package this comment is referring.</p> <p>The loss of local access and cross-corridor mobility is an unavoidable impact when considering an upgrade to a higher-level facility, such as a freeway with full control of access. The study team attempted to identify a reasonable range of alternatives that balanced the identified safety, mobility and accessibility needs in the study area as well as the public and study stakeholder feedback.</p> <p>As noted in the <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i>, the expressway lite facility type was developed in direct response to the public comments received throughout the study. Residents and other local stakeholders requested improved mobility through reduction or elimination of traffic signals without sacrificing accessibility to/from US 31. After considering these comments, the expressway lite facility type was developed to combine the driveway access aspects of arterial without signals (free flow) with the increased access management of expressway (free flow).</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					Expressway lite, however, would have properly designed median U-turn opening(s) at select locations to reduce how far drivers must travel when turning movements are limited to right-in/right-out and/or directional medians. The inclusion of the median U-turn openings would be limited and evaluated on a case-by-case basis in each planning segment based on access and safety considerations. This evaluation would occur during the project development process.
148	12/3/2024	Draft Level 3 Report	Multiple Intersections	<p>My sister and I are the owners of JJ's Convenience stores at the 100 N &amp; 850 S intersections in Miami county. We are not a large company. We are a small family business with only 8 stores. Affecting 2 out of 8 stores is an immense portion of our livelihood.</p> <p>In the Grissom section, with an interchange being installed at 850 S would completely take out our business. It is listed in the study as a "relocation". Even if compensated for the property, that doesn't make up for the lost future profits. Ourselves and the prior owners (Family friends of ours) spent many decades building up Goodwill and a loyal customer base that would just be lost. This business could not be "relocated". It is completely dependent on the location on the highway and convenient access for customers. Our business at this location would just be eliminated. Between us and the Subway franchise, We employ 20+ people at the 850 S location that would all lose their jobs. If the option with directional median openings or right in, right out only traffic is implemented, our business would be affected too.</p> <p>At JJ's the first thing we sell is convenience. If traffic can't conveniently access our store, they will not stop. At this location, another family business, Estep &amp; Co, operates a Subway Franchise in space leased from us. Estep &amp; Co is another family owned business and would be affected by changes or elimination of this store location.</p> <p>In the Miami Central section, our Truck Stop is located at the 100 N intersection. The options provided for right in, right out only, or directional median openings would affect our business and all other associated businesses. In addition to our convenience store/truck stop, DiMichel Enterprises operates the McDonald's Franchise, Estep &amp; Co operates the Subway Franchise, S&amp;S Truck Repair operates the truck repair facility, CAT Scale operates a truck scale. All of these businesses are family owned small businesses. Restricting CONVENIENT access would create a significant downturn for all of the businesses. The option of completely closing the 100 N intersection would completely close down our business and put close to 100 people out of jobs across all entities. Just like above, this business could not be "relocated". It is completely dependent on the location on the highway and convenient access for customers. All of the businesses at this location would just be eliminated. We strongly encourage the consultant(s) and the State of Indiana to take into consideration the effect on several small family businesses based on</p>	<p>In response to public comments and to minimize impacts, the Grissom Planning Segment has been updated to include an interchange at CR 800 S (as opposed to CR 850 S) in Packages 4 and 6. This is feasible due to an updated urban area boundary that is consistent with the interchange spacing criteria used in the study.</p> <p>Although CR 850 S would be closed in Improvement Package 6, the design concept considered for the interchange would provide a local access road on the west side of US 31, which would connect south to CR 850 S. The updates to Improvement Package 6 would no longer directly impact or require relocation of the referenced business.</p> <p>Thank you for your comment regarding the impacts to local access and cross-corridor mobility that would occur with implementing greater control of access in the study area.</p> <p>Based on public comment and coordination with study stakeholders, such as schools, emergency service providers and the local agricultural industry, the study team identified important crossings and access points. This information can be found in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Purpose and Need Report</i> found on the study website (<a href="https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/">https://propelus31.com/31doctrinary/</a>). This information was considered by the study team throughout the development and evaluation of alternatives.</p> <p>The loss of local access and cross-corridor mobility is an unavoidable impact when considering an upgrade to a higher-level facility, such as a freeway with full control of access. The study team attempted to identify a reasonable range of alternatives that balanced the identified safety, mobility and accessibility needs in the study area as well as the public and study stakeholder feedback.</p> <p>As noted in the <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i>, the expressway lite facility type was developed in direct response to the public comments received throughout the study. Residents and other local stakeholders requested improved mobility through reduction or elimination of traffic signals without sacrificing accessibility to/from US 31. After considering these comments, the expressway lite facility type was developed to combine the driveway access aspects of arterial without signals (free flow) with the increased access management of expressway (free flow).</p> <p>As part of the study, avoidance and minimization of adverse impacts, such as those to existing businesses like the truck stop and semi-truck repair shop, have been considered to the extent feasible in a planning study. These efforts will continue throughout the duration of the study and will also be a focus of any subsequent project development activities, including the NEPA environmental review.</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				their decisions to restrict, eliminate access, or completely take over business property.	
150a	12/4/2024	Overall US 31 Corridor	Overall Corridor	<p>Dear INDOT, I am writing to express significant concerns regarding the proposed closure of the intersection near the truck stop and semi-truck repair shop. While I understand the intention behind this plan to enhance safety and reduce congestion at the stop lights there are several critical issues that must be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>**Loss of Parking for Truckers**:</b> Truck drivers rely heavily on designated parking areas to comply with Hours of Service regulations, ensuring they can rest safely before continuing their journeys. Eliminating parking facilities at this location could force drivers to park in unsafe, unauthorized areas, potentially increasing the risk of accidents and exacerbating the problem of truck parking scarcity.</li> <li><b>**Impact on Vehicle Maintenance**:</b> The repair shop at this intersection plays a vital role in the logistics chain by providing essential maintenance and repair services. Closing off access could lead to increased instances of breakdowns on highways, creating hazardous conditions for both truck drivers and other motorists. This not only jeopardizes safety but also could lead to significant economic losses due to delayed freight deliveries.</li> <li><b>**Stranded Vehicles**:</b> Without nearby facilities for parking, rest, and repairs, the risk of trucks being stranded increases. This scenario presents several safety hazards, including: - Increased likelihood of trucks stopping in emergency lanes or shoulders, which are not designed for parking or maintenance. - Potential for drivers to exceed their driving hours in search of alternative facilities, leading to driver fatigue, a known factor in many road accidents.</li> <li><b>**Economic Impact**:</b> The truck stop and repair shop contribute to local and regional economies by providing jobs and supporting the trucking industry, which is crucial for goods transportation. The closure could lead to job losses and economic downturn in the area, which might not be offset by the perceived safety gains.</li> </ol>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding the Miami Central Planning Segment and the improvement alternatives considered at the CR 100 N intersection.</p> <p>The ProPEL US 31 South study is a planning study. No decisions have been made about the future of US 31, and no projects related to the PEL study have been funded by INDOT. At this time, there is no timeline for implementation of improvement projects associated with this study. Additionally, the exact locations and amounts of potential land acquisition (if required) have not been determined. This will require further study and additional detailed engineering work. Also, Packages 2 and 3, which were carried forward for further consideration, would not require the closure and/or relocation of the truck stop and semi-truck repair shop located at the CR 100 N intersection.</p> <p>As part of the study, avoidance and minimization of adverse impacts, such as those to existing businesses like the truck stop and semi-truck repair shop, have been considered to the extent feasible in a planning study. These efforts will continue throughout the duration of the study and will also be a focus of any subsequent project development activities, including the NEPA environmental review.</p>
150b				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>**Alternative Solutions**:</b> Rather than closing the intersection, have you considered other traffic management solutions? Options like: - Installing traffic calming devices or an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) to better manage traffic flow. - Exploring the expansion of the intersection or rerouting to accommodate both safety improvements and the operational needs of the truck stop and repair shop.</li> </ol>	<p>The primary transportation problem identified at the CR 100 N intersection is safety. No operational problems were identified at the existing signalized intersection. During the alternatives development and evaluation, a wide range of improvement alternatives were evaluated at this intersection, including transportation system management and operational (TSMO) strategies. Given the needs identified at this intersection, TSMO strategies were considered as complementary concepts, which are improvement alternatives that address some needs and could provide localized benefit at certain locations. For the CR 100 N intersection, a warning system and a freight priority system were identified for further consideration. See the</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					<i>Final Level 2 Screening Report</i> and the <i>Final Level 3 Screening Report</i> for more information on these items.
150c				6. <b>**Community and Stakeholder Engagement**</b> : It's crucial that the voices of truck drivers, local business owners, and community members are heard in the planning process. Their insights could provide valuable perspectives on how to balance safety, efficiency, and economic considerations. While the goal of improving road safety is commendable, it's essential that all potential consequences of such changes are thoroughly evaluated. The interconnected effects on safety, the economy, and the trucking industry cannot be overlooked. I urge INDOT to reassess this plan in collaboration with stakeholders to find a solution that addresses both safety concerns and the practical needs of the trucking community. Thank you for considering these points.	During the ProPEL US 31 South study, the study team has attempted to engage and consider the needs of the trucking industry. This included coordination with the Indiana Motor Trucking Association to distribute a survey to its state and regional members, which included a targeted distribution to 75 companies. In addition, the study team has met multiple times with the owners of the truck stop to understand their needs and concerns. Further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA and project development studies.
151	12/5/2024	Draft Level 3 Report	Not Specified	Looks totally unsafe. I drive that area weekly and I believe it will have catastrophic results ending with fatal results.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment. Unfortunately, it is unclear as to which planning segment or Improvement Package this comment is referring.  Maximizing the safety of our roads is a priority for INDOT. Current and projected (i.e., year 2045) roadway operating conditions were analyzed as part of the study. This information can be found in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Existing Transportation Conditions Report</i> , which is available on the study website ( <a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a> ). Based on the analysis, safety was identified as a concern throughout the study area. As a result, the study team evaluated alternatives to improve safety along US 31 by reducing the number and severity of crashes in the study area.
152	12/5/2024	Overall US 31 Corridor	Not Specified	Has INDOT indicated any intention for State Representative Ethan Manning to formally (though reactively) address this effort with his constituents?	Thank you for your comment regarding the stakeholder and public engagement for the ProPEL US 31 South study.  INDOT will continue efforts to collaborate with study stakeholders and the public directly to share information regarding the ProPEL US 31 South study and gather feedback. The ongoing engagement effort includes a variety of touchpoints to gather feedback from residents, motorists, businesses, and elected officials. The study teams strive to provide regular study updates via the ProPEL US 30 and 31 websites, social media channels, and community outreach events.
153	12/4/2024	Economic Development, Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor	Overall Corridor	As a weekly user I recommend for Miami Central-Package 3, Peru-Package 3, Grissom-Package 4, and Miami South-Package 3.	All of the improvement packages you discussed will be carried forward for consideration.
154	12/5/2024	Safety	Overall Corridor	This is a farming community. They have to have safe crossings across 31	Thank you for your comments regarding safe crossing locations for farming equipment.  All of the Improvement Packages included in the <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i> were analyzed, in part, because of their ability to address the safety issues identified within the study corridor. The Improvement Packages include at-grade (e.g., Reduced Conflict Intersections) and grade-

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					separated options (e.g., overpasses, interchanges). These improvement alternatives would improve safety to varying degrees.
155	12/7/2024		Overall Corridor	The traffic on 31 has become so heavy lately and very fast speeds. I can't imagine a large piece of machinery or semis trying to cross all of the traffic. Sometimes I have to wait quite awhile to cross over in my SUV. This proposal seems very dangerous.	<p>Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment. Unfortunately, it is unclear as to which planning segment or Improvement Package this comment is referring.</p> <p>Maximizing the safety of our roads is a priority for INDOT. Current and projected (i.e., year 2045) roadway operating conditions were analyzed as part of the study. This information can be found in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Existing Transportation Conditions Report</i>, which is available on the study website (<a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a>). Based on the analysis, safety was identified as a concern throughout the study area. As a result, the study team evaluated alternatives to improve safety along US 31 by reducing the number and severity of crashes in the study area.</p>
156	12/10/2024	Draft Level 3 Report	Overall Corridor	If you do not have the money to put in full interchanges or over passes then just leave 31 north and south alone. the speeds are fast enough now without taking out stop lights and home and business entrances. J turns will not work well with farm equipment, semis, and buses. Speeds on 31 are to fast to cross traffic to use a j turn.	<p>A "J-Turn" is one of several alternatives that fall within the family of Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs). Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>• The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA and project development studies.</p>
157	12/11/2024		Overall Corridor	A reduced conflict intersection is an absolute waste of resources for the state. The current traffic flow already makes it a dangerous task just to enter and exit the highway. Much less the exponential increases in traffic flow that will come when this project is finally completed. The actual speeds traveled on 31 (typically 70+mph), and the lack of options for crossing put those at risk trying to merge or cross the highway. There should be no consideration of anything other than an overpass with on ramps for this intersection. The large part of those effected are typically those surrounding agriculture. Machines with implements and commercial vehicles can not safely utilize the proposed reduced conflict intersection. Very simply put, build it right or don't build it at all	<p>Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> </ul>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA and project development studies.</p>
158	12/13/2024		Overall Corridor	<p>This will increase response time of all fire and ems services in Miami county due to all the county fire departments being on the east side of 31. Seconds count in an emergency and adding distance and time to a response is a bad idea when trying to get to someone to save their house that is on fire or loved one that could be having a life threatening issue. Think about it. Would you want yourself or any of your loved ones have to wait any longer for fire or ems to show up?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment regarding the impacts to local access and cross-corridor mobility that would occur with implementing greater control of access in the study area.</p> <p>Based on public comment and coordination with study stakeholders, such as schools, emergency service providers and the local agricultural industry, the study team identified important crossings and access points. This information can be found in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Purpose and Need Report</i> found on the study website (<a href="https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/">https://propelus31.com/31doclibrary/</a>). This information was considered by the study team throughout the development and evaluation of alternatives.</p> <p>The loss of local access and cross-corridor mobility is an unavoidable impact when considering an upgrade to a higher-level facility, such as a freeway with full control of access. The study team attempted to identify a reasonable range of alternatives that balanced the identified safety, mobility and accessibility needs in the study area as well as the public and study stakeholder feedback.</p> <p>As noted in the <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i>, the expressway lite facility type was developed in direct response to the public comments received throughout the study. Residents and other local stakeholders requested improved mobility through reduction or elimination of traffic signals without sacrificing accessibility to/from US 31. After considering these comments, the expressway lite facility type was developed to combine the driveway access aspects of arterial without signals (free flow) with the increased access management of expressway (free flow).</p>
159	12/13/2024		Overall Corridor	<p>Need more dedicated acceleration lanes when turning onto US31. Where traffic is not feasible to put in on ramps. For example US 31 at 800 S in Miami county. Turning Northbound onto US 31 has a great acceleration lanes ( but could use some better permanent dividers so people realize it exists). These acceperation lanes make accessing 31 so easy and would be cheap to implement vs other costly solutions.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding the need for acceleration lanes.</p> <p>As part of the Level 3 screening, adding or lengthening acceleration or deceleration lanes on US 31 was considered at all 18 primary intersections.</p>
160	12/13/2024	Bike and Pedestrian, Environmental, Overall US 31 Corridor	Overall Corridor	<p>Change sucks. But especially when it seem there will be no more highways left that have little traffic on them. I remember before the bypass was put in at Kokomo, 31 was a pleasant drive between South Bend and Indy. Now, it is getting more like other highways. And I miss being able to turn left off the highway instead of using the exit rounds. I don't care what studies say. I LIKED IT!</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment. It has been documented as part of the official study record.</p> <p>At this time, no decisions have been made about the future of US 31, and no projects related to the PEL study have been funded by INDOT.</p> <p>Please continue to check the website to stay informed about the study. Upcoming public meetings, community office hours, and additional study information will be posted on the study website when it is available (<a href="http://www.propelUS31.com">www.propelUS31.com</a>).</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
161a	12/13/2024		Overall Corridor	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments in response to the Planning and Environmental Linkage Study Level 3 Screening for the US 31 corridor. The members of the US 31 Coalition appreciate the work that you have put into this process.</p> <p>As you are aware, the members and communities comprising the US 31 Coalition have long advocated for a freeway improvement on the corridor. We appreciate the study team “carrying forward” a freeway option in the study. However, the imagined freeway layout that is included in the Level 3 report is insufficient to meet the needs that have been conveyed to the study team. We understand that freeways by definition direct traffic to specific access points in order to improve safety, however, we would request that some additional access or cross-road connection be considered in particular locations. As the individual projects move into environmental analysis and project development, we would want to be included in further conversations to define the actual layout.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding the ProPEL US 31 South study and the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i>.</p> <p>As noted in the <i>Level 2 Screening Report</i>, interchanges (i.e., freeway access points) were considered as potential solutions at some intersections based on traffic volumes, the proximity of existing and/or planned developments, consideration of overall network connectivity and access, and/or input from both the public and stakeholders. No specific traffic volume criteria or warrants exist for justification of an interchange; however, an interchange was considered as a potential solution when traffic volumes warranted signalization of the intersection, as documented in the <i>ProPEL US 31 South Existing Conditions Report</i>.</p> <p>When formulating improvement packages during the Level 3 screening, the study team used a minimum interchange spacing of 3 miles in rural areas and 1 mile in urban areas.</p> <p>In response to comments received on the <i>Draft Level 3 Screening Report</i>, an overpass has been added at County Road West 300 North (in the Sharpsville Planning Segment) to each Improvement Package carried forward for further consideration (Packages 2, 3, and 5) and at County Road West 500 South (in the East Union Planning Segment) to each Improvement Package carried forward for further consideration (Packages 2, 3, and 5). This will allow for better east-west mobility for vehicles, including farm equipment and trucks.</p> <p>There will be opportunities for additional public and stakeholder input as part of any NEPA and project development studies subsequent to the ProPEL US 31 South study.</p>
161b				<p>In addition, as none of the options presented seem to be a perfect solution for the corridor, we ask that the Level 3 screening and the final report not include differentiators such as “recommended” or “carried forward”. The study team has done great work to narrow the 55 options down to five, and we do not believe it is prudent to weight those choices to make purely cost-driven decisions until INDOT’s future funding is known. We ask that all choices move forward in an equal manner, unless specifically eliminated in the Level 3 analysis.</p>	<p>INDOT received several questions and comments seeking clarification on the Improvement Package ratings. More specifically, there was confusion between the Recommended and Carried Forward ratings since both would require further consideration after the PEL study. To provide greater clarity, all improvement packages evaluated in the <i>Final Level 3 Screening Report</i> were rated as Eliminated or Carried Forward.</p>
161c				<p>To that end, the members of the Coalition, along with the counties, cities and towns that are represented, have repeatedly made known their opposition to the use of r-cuts on the US 31 corridor. To have this improvement type considered once again is very disappointing. We</p>	<p>There are no R-CUT intersections in any of the Improvement Packages considered for the US 31 South study area. An “R-Cut” is one of several alternatives that fall within the family of Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs). An R-CUT intersection is similar in nature to an RCI intersection, but it utilizes a signal. Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				understand the cost favorability of an r-cut, however, we hope that INDOT will look at all the factors impacting this decision.	<p>worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>• The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA and project development studies.</p>
161d				Related to this concern, we disagree with the ranking of study goals for each section. The study states that a freeway is neutral or even negative for economic development, while an expressway or expressway light enhances economic development. When industries and economic development associations all along the corridor have specifically asked for a freeway for this very reason, we request that the study team reconsider the assumptions made in this section.	<p>A goal of the US 31 South study was to "Support the existing economy and/or planned economic development through improved safety, mobility and/or access." Table 2-4 in the report identified the criteria used to measure the performance of each package against this goal. In most cases, taken as a whole, the freeway packages received a "neutral" rating on this goal. It was the study team's judgment that any potential economic benefits will be offset by the significant losses in local access and reductions in cross-corridor mobility, as well as the direct impacts to adjacent businesses.</p> <p>Overall, the study team agrees that transportation investments can result in meaningful positive economic impacts. Although there may be potential economic development benefits associated with an upgraded roadway facility, the accurate estimation and analysis of these benefits is difficult and outside the scope of this planning study. Further analysis of potential economic benefits could occur during subsequent NEPA and project development studies.</p>
161e				While we understand that the packages included in the report represent a continuum of cost, mobility and access, there is no consideration of the benefits (economic or otherwise) in this analysis. If this cannot be included in the final report of the PEL, we strongly recommend that it be included in the NEPA analysis for individual segments.	The <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i> evaluated safety, mobility, and access benefits of the Improvement Packages within each planning segment. This evaluation process was intentionally set up to consider factors that measure an Improvement Package's ability to address the purpose and need for transportation improvements in the study area. Supporting economic development is a goal for the ProPEL US 31 South study area and was considered qualitatively during the Level 3 screening. See Section 3.7 of the <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i> for further information, including what criteria were considered in the analysis of this goal.
161f				Each county in the US 31 corridor has specific locations that need to be addressed for development projects, safety, or other concerns. We have included the intersections below and hope that INDOT will prioritize them as the projects move forward. These are not listed in any particular order, but all represent a need to be addressed sooner rather than later. Each have specific issues and may require a combination of improvements not included in any of the Level 3 options,	Thank you for the information regarding preferred priority locations, and it has been documented as part of the official study record. After the PEL study is complete, improvements carried forward from the study will be considered by INDOT as part of their traditional programming and project development processes. INDOT uses an objective, needs-based approach for new programming projects, so areas of highest need are addressed as funding is available. This process, which is known as the call for projects, is typically a five-year timeline. Please note your comments have been provided to the ProPEL US 31 North and ProPEL US 30

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				<p>which we would like to discuss further.</p> <p><u>Fulton County</u> Olson/Monticello Road interchange Old US 31/Southway 31 overpass Court Road 650 South (Speck's Corner) interchange</p> <p><u>Marshall County</u> US 31 and Lincoln Highway US 31 and 18th Road (this location is in the SR10-CR700N project underway; however, it is included in these comments for consideration in the PEL).</p> <p><u>Miami</u> US 31 and CR100N US 31 and Business 31 US 31 and SR 218 North US 31 and SR 18 US 31 and CR800S</p> <p><u>Tipton County</u> US 31 and CR450N US 31 and Division Road US 31 and CR500S</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment, and we look forward to continuing the conversation.</p>	West teams as well since the locations identified in your comments are also within those study areas.
162a	12/16/2024	Economic Development, Mobility, Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor	Overall Corridor	<p>A) Does your model include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Kokomo is getting a battery factory. It is supposed to be over 2 football fields long. Just getting material in and out will add traffic.</li> <li>2) IN28 &amp; US31 factory is reopening as a solar panel factory.</li> <li>3) Two water towers are being built, one at 276th St other at 236th St. Commercial or residential, that will add traffic to US31.</li> </ol> <p>If it doesn't have those 3 items, add them and redo the numbers.</p>	The ProPEL US 30 and US 31 studies evaluated existing and projected (i.e., year 2045) roadway operating conditions. The year 2045 traffic projections were generated by a traffic model created specifically for the ProPEL US 30 and US 31 studies (PEL studies model). The PEL studies model was created by taking INDOT's statewide model, which is a state-of-the-art traffic model used to predict traffic throughout the state and adding more detail around US 30 and US 31. The enhancements included adding local roads, calibrating the model based on traffic counts at over 350 locations, and accounting for imminent future land development. This model helps us understand current traffic volumes and how traffic will increase in the future on US 31, including how planned and approved developments like those mentioned in your comment will affect future traffic volumes in the study corridor. Traffic projections will likely be updated as part of any subsequent studies or during INDOT's traditional project development process.
162b		Economic Development, Mobility, Safety,	Overall Corridor	B) How close is US31 to being unsafe to cross - requiring bridges? Looking at some of the streets, there are cars backed up now and US31 is	Safety was identified as a concern throughout the study area. As a result, the <i>Level 2 greening Report</i> evaluated alternatives to improve safety along US 31 by reducing the number and severity of crashes in the study area. To accomplish this objective, several different alternatives were considered, including at-grade (e.g., Reduced Conflict Intersections) and grade-separated

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
		Overall US 31 Corridor		supposed to get worse. How soon will/you be needing to build bridges? Might be cheaper to do today.	options (e.g., overpasses and interchanges), as well as signalized and unsignalized options. The Level 2 Screening carried forward overpasses or interchanges for further consideration at 12 of 18 primary intersections. Additional overpasses were considered in the Level 3 screening based on public comments received. The <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i> carried forward overpasses or interchanges for further consideration at 12 intersections in the study area. See the <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i> for details on the specific locations.
162c		Economic Development, Mobility, Safety, Overall US 31 Corridor	Overall Corridor	C) Sharpsville needs a full interchange on US31. However, it does not need to be due West of the town. People going North can go to IN26. People going South are of interest. Putting the interchange a little further South would be okay- just don't make them go all the way to IN28/Division Rd.	As discussed in the <i>Level 3 Screening Report</i> , an interchange at CR 550 N was eliminated from further consideration in Level 3 due to interchange spacing guidelines. This intersection is in a rural area. Therefore, it would be too close to the existing interchange at SR 931 (approximately 1 mile). Access to/from US 31 at this intersection was noted as a potential Environmental Justice concern for the town of Sharpsville; therefore, the study team developed and analyzed a system interchange with SR 931 using collector-distributor roads to address the potential safety and operational issues associated with closely spaced interchanges. However, due to high potential impacts and costs, this alternative was eliminated from further consideration. For these reasons, an interchange at CR 550 N was not included as part of the Improvement Packages for the Sharpsville Planning Segment. Access concerns were raised regarding access to Sharpsville at CR 550 N, and for this reason Improvement Package 3 was revised. All Improvement Packages maintain the existing overpass at CR 600 N.
163	12/10/2024	Level 3 Screening Report	Tipton – Division Rd	<p>At the December 10, 2024 Community Office Hours event, the study team was presented with a hard copy of petition that was initiated on change.org and signed by more than 500 people. The petition text is below:</p> <p><u>The Issue</u></p> <p>I am a local farmer whose livelihood depends on the safety of Division Rd for crossing US 31 with large agricultural equipment. The US 31 Propel Study has released its two recommendations for the intersection of Division Rd and US 31 in Tipton County. One of the proposals is for a Reduced Conflict Interchange at US 31 and Division Rd. This type of interchange may bring unforeseen consequences for residents that cross this interaction.</p> <p>Reduced Conflict Intersections, while designed to minimize high-speed collisions, could meanwhile result in traffic bottlenecks on Division Rd. Such backups may cause considerable inconvenience for regular commuters and lead to potential safety issues, especially considering the wide-scale farming equipment that often uses this route.</p> <p>The farming community has relied on the current intersection for years. Many farmers in our community farm on both sites of US 31. Additional traffic and potential inability to safely cross US 31 due to the proposed interchange threatens our farming operations, livelihood,</p>	<p>The Improvement Packages carried forward for further consideration in the Tipton Planning Segment (Packages 1, 3, 4, and 6) include Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCIs) and quadrant interchanges at Division Road. These potential improvements would improve safety by reducing crossing conflict points, which pose the highest risk for severe right-angle crashes. Both improvement alternatives would safely accommodate farming equipment.</p> <p>Throughout the alternatives development and evaluation, the study team worked with the public and study stakeholders to understand the specific concerns associated with RCIs and proactively address them. Specific refinements made to the RCI design concepts considered in this study include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCIs will accommodate a WB-65 design vehicle. A WB-65 design vehicle is equivalent to an interstate semitrailer that is over 73 feet in length. This means that RCIs considered as part of this PEL study will accommodate larger vehicles and trucks, including interstate semitrailers as well as most large farm equipment that would need to navigate the intersection.</li> <li>• The RCIs include extra space on the outside for larger vehicles to safely and efficiently make the U-turn movement.</li> <li>• The RCIs include a short segment of additional lane on the outside to support traffic making the U-turn to safely merge into through traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Should an RCI be advanced by INDOT as a project (or as part of a larger project), further opportunities for public involvement and design concept refinement will occur as part of any subsequent NEPA studies.</p>

#	Date	Topic	Planning Segment/Location	Comment	Response
				<p>and the prolific agriculture sector of our community.</p> <p>It is our belief that the proposed Reduced Conflict Interchange, intended to improve safety, may inadvertently increase traffic accidents due its inability to handle large farm equipment</p> <p>We urge the US 31 Propel group to consider the potential risks of this type of intersection in an agriculture community and remove it from proposed interchange recommendations. We require safe and efficient roads to continue thriving as a farming community, and thus, we oppose the proposed Reduced Confit Interchange at US 31 and Division Rd. Sign this petition to support our cause and ensure road safety for all users.</p>	

Table C-2 – Responses to Agency and Tribal Nation Comments Received During the Level 3 Screening Report Comment Period

#	Date	Topic	Comment	Response
1	12/11/2024	Resource Agency Comment	<p>The staff of the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer (“Indiana SHPO”) has received your March 28, 2024, submission, which enclosed the Draft Level 2 [Level 3] Screening Report for ProPel US 31 South (HNTB, March 2024) which was received by our office the same day for this project in Hamilton County, Tipton County, Howard County, and Miami County; Indiana.</p> <p>From the information provided, it is the staff of the Indiana SHPO’s understanding that the Indiana Department of Transportation (“INDOT”) is conducting Planning and Environment Linkages (PEL) studies on the US 30 and US 31 corridors. The Universe of Alternatives Screening Technical Memorandum (HNTB, November 2023) and Draft Level 2 Screening Report (HNTB, March 2024) was prepared specifically for the ProPEL US 31 South portion of the study. Additionally, it is our understanding that as part of the data-gathering phase of these studies, the memorandum documents the initial screening of concepts that may address the transportation needs identified in the ProPEL US 31 South Purpose and Need Report. It is also our understanding, that as the study progresses, the screening and evaluation of the remaining alternatives in terms of feasibility and potential impacts will be performed in subsequently greater levels of detail – both qualitative and quantitative. Meeting the purpose, needs, and study goals will be confirmed in each subsequent screening, and public and stakeholder input will be sought at each level. The output of this process will be a prioritized set of reasonable alternatives. Our office will continue to review the alternatives as the process progresses; however, at this early stage we have no specific comments.</p> <p>As stated previously in our September 27, 2023 and December 18, 2023, responses to the archaeological cultural resources identification memorandum (Gray and Pape Heritage Management, 04/05/2023), and above-ground cultural resources identification memorandum (Gray and Pape Heritage Management, 03/23/2023), the memorandum specifically states that any improvement projects that develop with federal involvement as a result of these PEL studies must comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (“NHPA”) and its implementing regulations under 36 CFR Part 800. Under Section 106, federal agencies must identify and assess their actions on those cultural resources that are listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP and seek ways to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse effects. The memoranda state that formal determinations of NRHP eligibility will occur in the future to comply with the Section 106 process for any federally funded or approved project programmed from the ProPEL studies. Our office will assist the federal agency responsible for administering the project by evaluating the historical significance of the properties within the area of potential effect that will be part of future submissions to our office.</p> <p>The Indiana SHPO staff’s archaeological reviewer for this project is Wade T. Tharp, and the structures reviewer is Toni Lynn Giffin. however, if you have a question about the Section 106 process, please contact initially the INDOT Cultural Resources staff members who are assigned to this project.</p> <p>In all future correspondence about the ProPEL US 31 South Project in Hamilton, Howard, Miami, and Tipton Counties, Indiana, please refer to DHPA No. 31268.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review and provide comments on the Draft Level 3 Screening Report. As discussed at the virtual meeting on December 5, 2024, any subsequent project that moves forward from this study will comply with Section 106 as part of the required NEPA analysis.</p>

#	Date	Topic	Comment	Response
2	12/12/2024	Resource Agency Comment	<p>The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has reviewed the ProPel US 31 South Draft Level 3 Screening Report (Report), dated November 12, 2024, and has the following comments.</p> <p>These comments have been prepared under the authority of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et. seq.) and are consistent with the intent of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Mitigation Policy.</p> <p>The Report is the final step to identify a range of possible solutions to transportation issues along the US 31 South study corridor. It identifies seven planning segments, multiple improvement packages within each segment, and makes recommendations for the best packages and whether to eliminate or carry forward other packages. Considerations include cost, safety, environmental impacts (including natural, cultural and recreational, and community and socioeconomic resource impacts), and the ability of each package to meet project goals.</p> <p>The ProPEL US 31 South study area stretches from 276th Street in Hamilton County north to the State Road (SR) 931 south junction in Tipton County, and from the SR 931 north junction in Howard County north to County Road (CR) West 300 North in Miami County. The US 31 Kokomo bypass is excluded from the ProPEL US 31 South study area. The Service is particularly interested in impacts to forested habitat and the Eel River.</p> <p>2. Information about natural resource impacts in the Report is very general. Below is a list of federally listed and proposed species that may occur within the study area. This information is available from the Service's Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) website and is valid for up to 90 days. The Service recommends that the list be verified via IPaC at regular intervals during project planning and implementation to get updates to species listings and information.</p> <p><u>Federally endangered:</u></p> <p>Indiana bat (<i>Myotis sodalis</i>) and northern long-eared bat (<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>).</p> <p><u>Federally threatened:</u></p> <p>Rabbitsfoot mussel (<i>Quadrula cylindrica cylindrica</i>).</p> <p><u>Proposed federally endangered and threatened species:</u></p> <p>Salamander mussel (<i>Simpsonaias ambigua</i>) and Monarch butterfly (<i>Danaus Plexippus</i>).</p> <p><u>Federally endangered, Non-essential Experimental Population:</u></p> <p>Whooping crane (<i>Grus americana</i>).</p> <p>Bats</p> <p>The Indiana bat and NLEB have ranges that overlap with parts or all the project area. Indiana bats hibernate in caves then disperse to reproduce and forage in relatively undisturbed forested areas associated with water resources during spring and summer. Research has shown that they will also inhabit fragmented landscapes with adequate forest for roosting and foraging. Young are raised in nursery colony roosts in trees, typically near drainage-ways in</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review and provide comments on the Draft Level 3 Screening Report. Any subsequent project that moves forward from this study will analyze and avoid/minimize impacts to natural resources, including impacts to endangered, threatened, and rare species, as part of the required NEPA analysis.</p>

#	Date	Topic	Comment	Response
			<p>undeveloped areas. Like all other bat species in Indiana, the Indiana bat diet consists exclusively of insects.</p> <p>During the summer, NLEBs typically roost singly or in colonies in cavities, underneath bark, crevices, or hollows of both live and dead trees and/or snags (typically ≥3 inches depth at breast height). Males and non-reproductive females may also roost in cooler places, like caves and mines. NLEBs are opportunistic in selecting roosts, using tree species based on presence of cavities or crevices or presence of peeling bark. They have also been occasionally found roosting in structures like barns and sheds. NLEBs forage for insects in upland and lowland woodlots and tree lined corridors. During the winter they predominately hibernate in caves and abandoned mine portals.</p> <p>Depending on the selected alignments, the project may qualify for the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Rail Administration, and Federal Transit Administration’s Rangewide Programmatic Consultation for the Indiana bat and NLEB. Upcoming updates to this process include allowing for projects that extend beyond 300 feet from the edge of pavement. Since this project is in a very preliminary stage, we anticipate the updated process to be available when the project gets closer to section 7 consultation.</p> <p><b>Mussels</b></p> <p>The salamander mussel (and critical habitat) was proposed for listing in the Federal Register on August 22, 2023. The final rule has not yet been published. There are records of the mussel both upstream and downstream of the US 31 bridge over the Eel River although no critical habitat is within the project area.</p> <p>Rabbitsfoot mussels are known from various locations in the Eel River from North Manchester downstream to the confluence with the Wabash River at Logansport. Rabbitsfoot has been found in the vicinity of the US 31 bridge at the Eel River in two different surveys.</p> <p><b>Monarch Butterfly</b></p> <p>In December 2020, the Service determined that listing the monarch under the ESA was warranted but precluded by higher priority listing actions. Today, December 12, 2024, the Service announced a proposal to list the monarch butterfly as a threatened species with species-specific protections and flexibilities to encourage conservation under Section 4(d) of the ESA. The proposed 4(d) rule incentivizes proactive conservation efforts and allows actions that have beneficial or minimal impacts to monarchs and that do not threaten the species’ overall population. If warranted, final rules are typically issued within a year of the proposed rule. The monarch butterfly does not have federal protections currently. The entire proposed rule package can be found on regulations.gov by searching docket number FWS-R3-ES-2024-0137.</p> <p><b>Whooping Crane</b></p> <p>The whooping crane occurs only in North America, specifically within Canada and the United States, and is North America’s tallest bird. Whooping cranes are a long-lived species, with current estimates suggesting a maximum longevity of at least 30 years for individuals in the wild. Whooping cranes continue to face threats from alteration and destruction of habitat - including migratory habitat and winter habitat. Indiana is within the range of the eastern migratory non-essential population (NEP), an experimental population introduced in the early</p>	

#	Date	Topic	Comment	Response
			<p>2000s. When NEPs are located outside a National Wildlife Refuge or National Park, only two provisions of section 7 of the ESA apply: Section 7(a)(1) and section 7(a)(4). Federal agencies are not required to consult with the Service under section 7(a)(2).</p> <p>Other resources</p> <p>The tricolored bat is found in Indiana although the current known distribution does not include the project area. The TCB is a small insectivorous bat that typically overwinters in caves, abandoned mines and tunnels, and road-associated culverts (southern portion of the range) and spends the rest of the year in forested habitats, typically roosting among live and dead leaf clusters in tree branches. As recommended above, please continue to periodically update and review the IPaC species list. The tricolored bat (<i>Perimyotis subflavus</i>) was proposed for listing as endangered on September 14, 2022. We do not know when or if this proposed listing will be finalized, but it could occur soon. No critical habitat has been proposed.</p> <p>Bald eagle populations have continued to increase in recent years and are often found along large rivers and reservoirs. There are multiple bald eagle nesting records in Miami, Howard, and Hamilton Counties. Coordination under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act may be necessary if any nests are found near the proposed alignment(s). Additional information on bald eagles and permitting requirements can be found at: <a href="https://www.fws.gov/midwest/eagle/">https://www.fws.gov/midwest/eagle/</a>.</p> <p>Wetland and stream impacts may require permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Indiana Department of Environmental Management's Water Quality Certification program, and the Indiana Department of Natural Resources. Wetland impacts should be avoided, and any unavoidable impacts should be compensated for in accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers mitigation guidelines.</p> <p>Depending on the packages or alternatives selected, the proposed project may have impacts to some or all the above-listed species. We recommend the selection of packages with the least forest, wetland, and stream impacts where possible to reduce adverse effects to federally protected species. This information is provided for technical assistance purposes and does not constitute consultation under section 7 of the ESA.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to coordinate early in the process to help reduce impacts to natural resources and look forward to reviewing additional project details once those are available. If you have any questions or need more information, please feel free to contact Robin McWilliams Munson of my staff at <a href="mailto:Robin_McWilliams@fws.gov">Robin_McWilliams@fws.gov</a>.</p>	

DRAFT