Comment No.	Name/Organization/ Comment Date	Comment	Response
1	Dick Nottingham 411 E 600 N Alexandria, IN 46001 April 16, 2019 (verbal comment) April 16, 2019 (written comment)	Verbal comments: A. I think this project could be a major problem if you are a large-scale farmer and trying to get wide long equipment through these turns. You know 4-wheel drive tractor with 2 or 3 pieces of folded up wide tillage equipment behind you, a grain semi, or a pickup truck pulling a forty foot header behind you trying to make - it's a sharp turn you have to make to go keep going to the other direction. And if you get some of that two or three in a row that whole lane could be full. B. I think it would be a lot simpler to put in a traffic signal such as at 500 W. In fact, I think 600 W should have had a higher priority than 500 W because 600 W connects several high schools, several towns. Yorktown, West Del; Gaston, Matthews, Upland, Taylor University, Eastbrook on up to Vanburen. It's a main road, has been for decades. It should have had a traffic signal first and I think that would simplify everything greatly and be a lot cheaper. Written comment: A. Installing u-turns could cause more problems than it could solve. Wide and long farm equipment would have major problems trying to blend into traffic as it tries to cross into the outer lane. This equipment has very slow acceleration rates; the same is similar for semis and dump trucks. Slow-moving equipment such as this could easily clog up the u-turn lanes, especially when there is a lot of traffic on SR 332. B. U-turns could easily cause confusion, especially for drivers unaccustomed to them. C. "Low" curbs in the intersection meant to direct traffic in certain directions are supposed to permit emergency vehicles to drive over them in order to go straight through the intersection north and south. Curbs of 4 inches in height were mentioned. Curbs that high could cause damage to police cruisers, ambulances, and even	Verbal comments: A. The J-Turn has been engineered to allow vehicles up to 104 feet (ex. triple-semi-trailer) to safely utilize the median U-turn lane. Vehicle queueing within the median U-turn lane is comparable, if not, more than the existing non-signalized left turn lanes. B. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs. In 2014, INDOT initiated a project to address safety problems at the intersection of SR 332 and CR 500 W. The pre-signal Index of Crash Frequency (ICF) at CR 500 W was 2.05 and the Index for Crash Cost (ICC) was 2.10. One of the alternatives discussed was a restricted crossing U-turn (J-turn) but the local public was opposed. While a permanent solution was being discussed, INDOT installed a temporary signal at the intersection. With a temporary signal in place, it was easier to transition that intersection to a permanent signal. As noted in the environmental document, the ICF was 1.06 and the ICC was 1.49 for the intersection of SR 332 and CR 600 W between 2010 and 2015, which are still considered unacceptable. However, when comparing the crash data of CR 500 W versus CR 600 W, it is apparent the former presented more of a concern due to the drastically higher ICF and ICC. This may have weighed into the decision of why CR 500 W was addressed first. Additionally, while CR 600 W connects several institutions and municipalities, it should be noted that there are a number of residential subdivisions and a golf course along CR 500 W that may have influenced the decision to prioritize that intersection. It should also be noted that although problems may still be present at CR 500, that intersection was outside of the scope of this project.

		fire trucks if the curbs were climbed at more than low speed. Also, there will be too many other drivers that will try to climb these curbs instead of using the u-turns. Damage will occur to the vehicles of these drivers and traffic accidents could occur. This project seems have been approached without examining the practicality in an area of high traffic counts at various times, especially with a north-south road that handles traffic from several towns, high schools, and a university over a span of close to 35 miles. Practicality seems to have been ignored at some of the "round-abouts" in the state. One at SR 32 and US 421 seems to be too "tight" to allow long-trailer and double-trailer semis to move through. There is one next to Kahlo Dodge in Noblesville that is too much tight to permit vehicle deliveries. Again, practicality seems to have been ignored. D. Installing a traffic signal, synchronized with the one at CR 500W and with sensor pads (similar to the traffic signals at intersections to the east (and elsewhere), is the best choice. The cost is less, the design is much simpler, large and/or long equipment (such as farm equipment) would move through the intersection in a much simpler manner without having to yield to fast-moving traffic, and emergency vehicles could move through the intersection more simply and without potential damage to the vehicles. It would also be simpler for drivers because they are very accustomed to traffic signals. The proposed design, as presented, would be more complex and more expensive. E. If businesses move westward in future decades, a more sophisticated traffic signal (such as at Nebo Road or at Morrison Road) could be installed along with additional traffic lanes. Another approach in future decades could be the construction of a diamond interchange; part of the space needed already exists in the northwest corner of the intersection. This could be needed if traffic increases on SR 332.	A need to address safety and intersection efficiency at CR 600 was identified as well. <u>Written comment:</u> A. See response to comment A under verbal comments above regarding the concern over the size of vehicle being able to make the U-turn. Additionally, after successfully making the U-turn the larger vehicles will not be immediately forced into the higher-speed travel lanes. Rather, they will have about 600 feet of a designated right-turn lane that drops at CR 600 W in which to accelerate and merge into the through lane. B. The intersection will be constructed with adequate traffic signs and pavement markings to indicate the appropriate maneuvering at the intersection and navigate motorists. In addition, lighting will be provided at the intersection to provide better visibility at night. C. The proposed mountable curbs are typical for these types of situations and are similar to those used in roundabouts throughout the state. The mountable curbs are rolled back from the edge of pavement and not vertical faced as typically observed in developed corridors. As such, these types of curbs should not cause damage to the higher sitting emergency vehicles. D. Considering the inclusion of a traffic signal is provided in Response B to the verbal comments provided by this commenter above. The issue about accommodating larger vehicles and their ability to accelerate and blend into oncoming traffic are addressed in Response A to the verbal comment and Response A to the written comment provided by this commenter above. E. The preferred alternative is designed with 20-year traffic projections and long-range development in mind that is based on the current comprehensive plans. To that end, the preferred alternative should be able to accommodate the projected growth within that 20-year horizon. The issue about considering a traffic signal is provided in Response B to the verbal comments provided by this commenter above. Based on current traffic volumes and due to associated cost and impacts, an interchange at this location is not warranted at this time.

		F. Concern was expressed regarding the high speeds of some drivers. This is a problem for the present intersection and would be a problem with a u-turn intersection, especially for slower-moving equipment attempting to move through the intersection. State Police and the Delaware County Sheriff's Department need to be alerted to the necessity of increasing speed patrols the entire length of SR 332. When police are high visible and many tickets are issued, the message "gets out there" and many people can "take a hint". However, police agencies are undermanned, underfunded, and very busy with other problems, such as drugs.	F. The speed limit of SR 332 will remain 55 mph. That speed limit will be posted. The concern regarding the ability for larger vehicles to make the median U-turn and their ability to accelerate and merge into through traffic has already been addressed. Please refer to Response A to the verbal comment and Response A to the written comment provided by this commenter above. Local and state law enforcement will still be responsible for patrolling SR 332.
2	Jeff Mosier 3201 N 600 W Muncie, IN 47304 April 16, 2019 (verbal comment)	<u>Verbal comment:</u> A. I'm here to tell you that not one of those accidents was caused by the intersection. They were all caused by people who were in a hurry. I was interested tonight to learn that intersections are graded by the wait time and the wait time is the judging score of frustration and that's what's caused all of those accidents. B. Something should be done to improve the intersection there is absolutely no question about that. I think a lower cost and a more sensible solution would be to simply remove the stop light that shouldn't have been placed at 500 as the other gentleman said and put a safe stop light at 600 W.	<u>Verbal comments:</u> A. The speed limit of SR 332 will remain 55 mph. That speed limit will be posted and local and state law enforcement will still be responsible for patrolling SR 332. The level of service (LOS) is the metric by which all intersections can be assessed for operational efficiency. Accident (crash) history is another metric used to identify deficiencies with an intersection. The combination of the low LOS along the CR 600 W approaches (LOS D) and the high frequency of accidents at the intersection are the driving factors behind the need to improve this intersection. B. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs. In 2014, INDOT initiated a project to address safety problems at the intersection of SR 332 and CR 500 W. The pre-signal ICF at CR 500 W was 2.05 and the ICC was 2.10. One of the alternatives discussed was a restricted crossing U-turn (J-turn) but the local public was opposed. While a permanent solution was being discussed, INDOT installed a temporary signal at the intersection. With a temporary signal in place, it was easier to transition that intersection to a

			permanent signal. As noted in the environmental document, the Index of Crash Frequency (ICF) was 1.06 and the Index for Crash Cost (ICC) was 1.49 for the intersection of SR 332 and CR 600 W between 2010 and 2015, which are still considered unacceptable. However, when comparing the crash data of CR 500 W versus CR 600 W, it is apparent the former presented more of a concern. This may have weighed into the decision of way CR 500 W was addressed first. Additionally, while CR 600 W connects several institutions and municipalities, it should be noted that there a number of residential subdivisions and a golf course along CR 500 W that may have influenced the decision to prioritize that intersection. It should also be noted that although problems may still be present at CR 500, that intersection was outside of the scope of this project. A need to address safety and intersection efficiency at CR 600 was identified as well.
3	Dennis Nixon 7916 W Adare Dr Muncie, IN 47304 April 16, 2019 (verbal comment)	<u>Verbal comment:</u> A. My concern is when the tractors are making u-turns with high speed 55 mph 60 mph traffic coming up behind us and taking not just "a" lane but a lane and half -just to make things clear about -there is no width restriction on any type of farm machinery in Indiana. Whether it be 14 feet or 20 feet wide we have the right to take it up and down the road. A couple of things, I would be, I would be leery of rear end crashes just because of making a u-turn in a loaded semi or a piece of farm machinery that's only going accelerate up to about 20 to 22 mph with 50 mph cars coming behind us. That would be my concern. B. The other concern is if we've got a peak of an hour where we are getting an F at an intersection why-why are we changing something that's bad for one hour a day out of 23? I think that's a little bit ridiculous to try and make something that effects people one hour a day. C. The other thing is I think this type of intersection would probably increase our traffic on 500 and 700 to avoid this type of turn. The other thing I question is what are we gonna do in 20 years when that intersection becomes a development as development moves out 332, moves up and down 600 as it has on 500, what are we gonna do with the j-turn when then that becomes	<u>Verbal comment:</u> A. The J-Turn has been engineered to allow vehicles up to 104 feet (ex. triple-semi-trailer) to safely utilize the median U-turn lane. Vehicle queueing within the median U-turn lane is comparable, if not, more than the existing non-signalized left turn lanes. After successfully making the U-turn the larger vehicles will not be immediately forced into the higher-speed travel lanes. Rather, they will have about 600 feet of a designated right-turn lane that drops at CR 600 W in which to accelerate and merge into the through lane. B. Design for any highway project is always done so for the peak AM and PM hours. This is always represented by 1-2 hours of heaviest traffic volumes during the morning and evening times. It is for these busiest times that engineers want to make sure their design works properly. If unimproved, the projected intersection LOS is an F in both morning and afternoon peak periods. This is outside the allowable limits of the state guidelines. C. The intersection will be constructed with adequate traffic signs and pavement markings to indicate the appropriate maneuvering at the intersection and navigate motorists. In addition, lighting will be provided at the intersection to provide better visibility at night. Additionally, there may be some driver diversion initially to avoid the intersection, but as the drivers become accustomed to the allowable movements at the intersection, driver diversion is anticipated to decrease.

		overloaded. Do we take it out and put a stoplight up which I think would probably be a good idea now.	
4	Susan Fatzinger April 16, 2019 (verbal comment)	Verbal Comment: A. The problem is not necessarily the intersection but those driving in the area. The speed is a concern. I've asked for more speed limit signs although no one seems to understand about 55. I've ask for even parked state police cars. Just state police, a presence. Arrest a few people. Give them some warnings. And I was told by INDOT on line several months ago my questions had been resolved. So you have my sympathy on 600. Yes the stoplight at 500 is a help. The right turn lane absence is not a help. There are other things that could be done that might not disrupt so much and make us safer and I believe the first and the cheapest is regulating the speed and enforcing it.	Verbal comment: A. The speed limit of SR 332 will remain 55 mph. That speed limit will be posted and local and state law enforcement will still be responsible for patrolling SR 332.
5	Dr. McFarland 9414 West Canal Street Yorktown, IN April 16, 2019 (verbal comment)	Verbal comment: A. You say it's cost effective so but how much is the cost of a median u-turn compared to the cost of the light. In other words, how much would it cost to put in a light? B. How many accidents are there right now at 500? Talking about a safety issue that people may get rear ended at 600 with this -if we had a light there. There is already a light at 500 so that probably would give us some read on how many might happen there? C. How much would it cost to synchronize the lights from Nebo, if we put in one at 500 and again at 600. How much would it cost to synchronize those lights from Nebo all the way out so the traffic could keep going? Especially at least during peak hour? If nothing else. D. How long is an LOS C since that's the target? E. What is the traffic data for 500?	Verbal comment: A. The preferred alternative, construction of a J-turn is projected to cost $1,334,167 (2020). The anticipated cost of a traffic signal is estimated to be $600,000. These costs do not include the long-term maintenance costs for either option and only represent the cost to construct. B. Traffic analysis was conducted pre- and post-signal installation at CR 500 West. The RoadHAT 2.0 program was used to compute the Index of Crash Frequency (ICF) and the Index of Crash Cost (ICC). For the pre-signal condition, the ICF at SR 332 and CR 500 West was 2.05 and the ICC was 2.10. For the post-signal condition, the ICF decreased to -0.49 and the ICC decreased to -0.96. This shows a sharp decrease in the more serious (i.e. personal injury) crashes and total crashes. The intersection of SR 332 and CR 500 West averages less than 1 rear end crash per year, but there have been 3 such crashes with the signal. A spike of rear end crashes when a new signal is installed is not unusual and may not necessarily be an indication of a long-term trend. C. The identified preferred alternative calls for the construction of a J-turn intersection, and not a signal. Therefore, the investigation into synchronizing traffic lights along SR 332 at this intersection as well as the other two mentioned is outside the scope of this

			investigation. This request has been provided to INDOT for consideration in future corridor improvements. D. LOS C is defined as a 20-35 second delay per vehicle through an intersection. It is described as "occasional delays". E. The intersection of SR 332 and CR 500 W received a LOS A or B in the design year for a no-build alternative and with a permanent traffic signal the intersection LOS remains unchanged (LOS A or B).
6	Karla Gibson 9901 W Conner Road Gaston, IN April 16, 2019 (verbal comment)	Verbal comment: A. I'm not understanding why lights can't be synchronized if you're saying that traffic is only heavy on 600 W during 2 hours in the morning and 2 hours in the afternoon. Why those lights couldn't	Verbal comment: A. Design for any highway project is always done so for the peak AM and PM hours. This is always represented by 1-2 hours of heaviest traffic volumes during the morning and evening times. It is for these busiest times that engineers want to make sure their design works properly. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs. The identified preferred alternative calls for the construction of a J-turn intersection, and not a signal. Therefore, the investigation into synchronizing traffic lights along SR 332 at this intersection as well as the other two mentioned is outside the scope of this investigation. This request has been provided to INDOT for consideration in future corridor improvements.
7	Brian Huffman 5220 N CR 500 W Muncie, IN 47304 April 15, 2019 (verbal comment)	Verbal comment: A. I personally don't like a traffic light on a highway. It is by about every measure a limited access like an interstate so I say build an overpass. Let's do it right. Like an interstate, I would hope that would eliminate every problem. Giving the farmers enough clearance and enough room. I can't imagine the State of Indiana trying	Verbal comment: A. Based on current traffic volumes and due to associated cost and impacts, an interchange at this location is not warranted at this time.

		to force this on Madison or make that Marion County or Hamilton County. Seems to me that they get an undo proportion of our state highway budget. So I would really like to encourage everybody to get behind the idea of an overpass, entrance ramps and deceleration ramps.	
8	Barbara Baker 1019 South Yorkchester Road Yorktown, IN April 16, 2019 (verbal comment)	Verbal comment: A. There are concerns about the speeds of motorists travelling east along SR 332 coming from I-69 at speeds of 60-70 mph and the perceived safety concerns associated with these high speeds. B. I am for a stoplight. I wanted a stoplight there when it first started. And I really feel that's what we need instead of the turnaround because I have a feeling there will be more. And my husbands from Michigan. So and he doesn't agree with the Michigan turnarounds either. Thank you	Verbal comment: A. The speed limit of SR 332 will remain 55 mph. That speed limit will be posted and local and state law enforcement will still be responsible for patrolling SR 332. B. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs.
9	Tom Malapit Indianapolis Resident April 16, 2019 (verbal comment)	Verbal comment: A. **A stop light is probably more beneficial than this j-turn... Well maybe a better thought would be, put a turn lane but leave the two lanes and put a stop light to slow the traffic down as it comes into Muncie.** B. **There are concerns about farm equipment travelling across SR 332 along CR 600 West and having to use the J-turn at slower speeds. Mr. Malapit is concerned about other motorists along SR 332 having to slow down to allow for these traffic movements.** C. **These j-turns are the most confusing intersections I've ever encountered. I mean it is the most bizarre thing to think you are going to go down to a j-turn and that somehow, you are going to stop there and it's going to be safer to turn in front of oncoming traffic and make a u-turn than making a turn at a signaled light.**	Verbal comment: A. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs. B. The J-Turn has been engineered to allow vehicles up to 104 feet (ex. triple-semi-trailer) to safely utilize the median U-turn lane. Vehicle queueing within the median U-turn lane is comparable, if not, more than the existing non-signalized left turn lanes. After successfully making the U-turn the larger vehicles will not be immediately forced into the higher-speed travel lanes. Rather, they will have about 600

			feet of a designated right-turn lane that drops at CR 600 W in which to accelerate and merge into the through lane. C. The intersection will be constructed with adequate traffic signs and pavement markings to indicate the appropriate maneuvering at the intersection and navigate motorists. In addition, lighting will be provided at the intersection to provide better visibility at night. Additionally, there may be some driver diversion initially to avoid the intersection, but as the drivers become accustomed to the allowable movements at the intersection, driver diversion is anticipated to decrease.
11	Lori Reed April 17, 2019 (written comment	Written comment: A. Please do not put in a J-tum on 332 at 600 West. I have used this intersection for 37 years and it is dangerous enough without putting in a J-Turn. Please, please please don't. A stop light would be much safer. Thank you!	Written comment: A. The intersection will be constructed with adequate traffic signs and pavement markings to indicate the appropriate maneuvering at the intersection and navigate motorists. In addition, lighting will be provided at the intersection to provide better visibility at night. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs.
12	Chris Slaven Yorktown resident April 18, 2019 (written comment)	Written comment: A. My family uses that intersection daily and I foresee an increased accident risk with the proposed J-turn. Traffic moves too fast to safely maneuver crossing traffic to get to the necessary turns. B. Not to mention the unnecessary complexity of using a J-turn, time lost, and an obstacle for the residents of Yorktown and Gaston communities to patronize one another's businesses and amenities. C. I am in favor of a stoplight. Traffic lights can be automated to support smooth traffic patterns. I have witnessed the improved traffic movement and safety	Written comment: A. A reasonable expectation of positive safety effect of a J-Turn intersection is 60% to 80% for severe crashes (those that result in one or more fatalities or injuries serious enough to require hospital treatment). Information is included here: http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/intersection/innovative/uturn B. The intersection will be constructed with adequate traffic signs and pavement markings to indicate the appropriate maneuvering at the intersection and navigate motorists. In addition, lighting will be provided at the intersection to provide better visibility at night. C. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would

		since the light at 500 west was installed. As a side note, the 500 west stop light was initially not automated for a safe traffic pattern, but has since been corrected.	meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs. The signal that was initially installed at CR 500 W in July 2014 was a temporary signal. Due to the improvements it made to the operations at that intersection, INDOT moved to make it a permanent traffic signal.
13	Betty Morgan 6300 N 600 W Gaston, IN 47342 April 18, 2019 (written comment)	Written comment: A. Please count my vote to put a stop light at this intersection instead of J Curve. Most of the time I drive to 500W where there is a light to cross 4 lane 332. Making about 3 miles extra driving.	Written comment: A. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs. There may be some driver diversion initially to avoid the intersection, but as the drivers become accustomed to the allowable movements at the intersection, driver diversion is anticipated to decrease.
14	Eric Brown 6320 N CR 575 W Gaston, IN 47342 April 18, 2019 (written comment)	Written comment: A. Northbound on county road 600 crossing the highway is especially bad because other drivers wanting to turn east on 332 constantly pull up beside/past you and block your field of sight. The westbound traffic on 332 can be especially difficult to see/judge from either side of 600 west due to the rise in the highway itself from that direction.	Written comment: A. The proposed J-Turn intersection meets sight distance requirements for a roadway having this speed.
15	John Parsons	Written comment:	Written comment:

	1009 West Abbott Street Muncie, IN 47303 April 19, 2019 (written comments)	A. My first concern about this type turn is the learning curve connect to using this type of turn because very few people in Delaware County have seen this type of turn. While I understand that people use the turn on a regular basis will become comfortable use this type of intersection, however this type of turn is rare in Indiana and people that are not seen this type of turn will be confused by. We have seen this type of learning curve Roundabouts and Double Roundabout. I know some of these Roundabout intersection are confusing to me because rarely drive on road with Roundabouts and I feel the same confused will be felt by people that rarely use J-Turn. This concern maybe over with time. B. The second concern I have is one that will never change. That concern is how Farm Equipment and Semi Truck are forced to use the turn when crossing IN 332. A long piece of farm equipment or semi truck must go to the outside lane of the highway, then they are forced to cross the inside lane of traffic to make the turn. The farm equipment or semi truck then must cross both lane of traffic traveling the opposite direction to complete the turn. This turning action means that the farm equipment or semi truck will be blocking all the lanes of traffic in making the turn. The is high speed traffic on IN 332 and having a piece of equipment being in all lanes of IN 332 is a very dangerous condition concerning the time involve in farm equipment or semi trucks making a turn in that type of intersection.	A. The intersection will be constructed with adequate traffic signs and pavement markings to indicate the appropriate maneuvering at the intersection and navigate motorists. In addition, lighting will be provided at the intersection to provide better visibility at night. Additionally, there may be some driver diversion initially to avoid the intersection, but as the drivers become accustomed to the allowable movements at the intersection, driver diversion is anticipated to decrease. B. The J-Turn has been engineered to allow vehicles up to 104 feet (ex. triple-semi-trailer) to safely utilize the median U-turn lane. Vehicle queueing within the median U-turn lane is comparable, if not, more than the existing non-signalized left turn lanes. After successfully making the U-turn the larger vehicles will not be immediately forced into the higher-speed travel lanes. Rather, they will have about 600 feet of a designated right-turn lane that drops at CR 600 W in which to accelerate and merge into the through lane.
16	Charles Ayers April 19, 2019 (written comment)	<u>Written comment:</u> **A.** Please consider using Traffic Lights as illustrated in the 4/18 Muncie Star, for the 600W / 332 intersection at Yorktown.	<u>Written comment:</u> A. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs.

17	Carol Scanameo April 20, 2019 (written comment)	Written comment: A. I agree with those residents who were present that evening that I prefer a traffic light at the intersection over a J turn. I find drivers do not respect the 55 mph speed limit on 332 and I feel a traffic light would be safer for drivers.	Written comment: A. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs.
18	Randy Walker April 24, 2019 (written comment)	Written comment: A. There should be no more stoplights on in 332 west of 500. This is a limited access highway. The stop light at 500 worked okay until it was changed to only left turn on arrow, now traffic on 332 always gets stopped for one or two cars turning. All local traffic on 600 should go one mile to 500 to get to a stoplight if crossing 332 is such a problem. If a stoplight is a must then it should allow left turns without stopping 332 traffic.	Written comment: A. The preferred alternative for this project involves maintain free flowing traffic for motorists along SR 332 and will not involve a traffic light at the intersection of SR 332 and CR 600 West.
19	Becky Monroe President & Founder of the Yorktown/Mt. Pleasant Twp. Historical Alliance April 25, 2019 (written comment)	Written comment: A. I see no need to go to the expense of this project when a traffic light would be much less expensive. There is a high rate of Semi and Farm Traffic in this area -I question the ability of this type of vehicle being able to accomplish the needed turns.	Written comment: A. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs. The J-Turn has been engineered to allow vehicles up to 104 feet (ex. triple-semi-trailer) to safely utilize the median U-turn lane. Vehicle queueing within the median U-turn lane is comparable, if not, more than the existing non-signalized left turn lanes.
20	Diana Thornburg 1004 S Stratford Ct Yorktown, IN 47396	Written comment: A. Large vehicles such as school buses, farm equipment, semi's, or trucks with trailers will have difficulty making	Written comment: A. The J-Turn has been engineered to allow vehicles up to 104 feet (ex. triple-semi-trailer) to safely utilize the median U-turn lane. Vehicle

	April 29, 2019 (written comment)	this sharp u-turn rapidly enough to get out of the way of traffic. B. I do know there is some plan for a slight curb that emergency vehicles could navigate to get across the intersection in the usual manner. What's to keep other vehicles from using this? C. I do think if anything is needed at this intersection, it is a traffic signal. I realize that this further restricts traffic flow but so will large vehicles trying to make a sharp u-turn to get across the road into the merge lane.	queueing within the median U-turn lane is comparable, if not, more than the existing non-signalized left turn lanes. B. The intersection will be signed appropriately notifying motorists of the crossing restriction to non-emergency vehicles. Local and state law enforcement will be responsible for patrolling SR 332. This would include the illegal crossing of the mountable curbs by non-emergency vehicles. This is the same principle that applies to who will keep motorists from speeding through a yellow or red light at a signalized intersection. C. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs.
21	Dr. Bruce McFarland April 30, 2019 (written comment)	<u>Written comment:</u> A. Are there any statistics on the intersection of IN-332 and CR 500W? It is just down the road and would surely give an accurate idea as to how adding a traffic light has helped or hindered safety and/or traffic flow. How many rear-end accidents have there been at that light? B. What about traffic data at SR 332 and Nebo Road? C. The gentleman also noted that special mountable raised curbs would be installed so Emergency Vehicles could go right through without delay. Do we really think that no one, especially teenagers, will take the opportunity to avail themselves of this feature? D. It seems that installing a traffic light at the intersection in question would be much less expensive to install, and considerably less costly to maintain, thereby making it more cost-effective than the proposed Median U-Turn. It seems like it would also be even safer than the	<u>Written comment:</u> A. Traffic analysis was conducted pre- and post-signal installation. The RoadHAT 2.0 program was used to compute the Index of Crash Frequency (ICF) and the Index of Crash Cost (ICC). For the pre-signal condition, the IFC at SR 332 and CR 500 West was 2.05 and the ICC was 2.10. In the post-signal condition, the ICF decreased to -0.49 and the ICC decreased to -0.96. This shows a sharp decrease in the more serious (i.e. personal injury) crashes and total crashes. The intersection of SR 332 and CR 500 West averages less than 1 rear end crash per year, but there have been 3 such crashes with the signal. A spike of rear end crashes when a new signal is installed is not unusual and may not necessarily be an indication of a long-term trend. B. In August 2016, INDOT completed and Engineering Assessment for intersection improvements at CR 400 W (Nebo Road), CR 500 W, and CR 600 W. After that study, each intersection was advanced independently of one another. The Nebo Road intersection is not within the scope of this project. Therefore, current traffic data for it is not available.

		proposed turn, but I have no data to back up that claim- but INDOT probably does, yes? E. To ease traffic flow, this traffic light should be synchronized with the lights at the intersections of IN-332 and CR 500W, and IN-332 and Nebo. In addition, signs could/should be posted stating the speed one needs to drive to be able to go through these lights at a steady speed. Synchronization of lights, with signs informing drivers of the optimum speed one can drive without needing to brake or speed up to get through, seems like the safest and most cost-effective alternative. Am I wrong? F. If reducing the number of travel lanes from 2 to 1 is part of this project, it raises concerns about longevity. It seems that development along IN-332 will eventually fill in from Morrison to I-69. With that in mind, funneling traffic from the current two lanes in both directions down to one lane in both directions would require a large-scale overhaul in the future. Installing a synchronized light, on the other hand, would likely still be functional regardless of the increased traffic flow from future development.	C. The intersection will be signed appropriately notifying motorists of the crossing restriction to non-emergency vehicles. Local and state law enforcement will be responsible for patrolling SR 332. This would include the illegal crossing of the mountable curbs by non-emergency vehicles. This is the same principle that applies to who will keep motorists from speeding through a yellow or red light at a signalized intersection. D. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs. A reasonable expectation of positive safety effect of a J-Turn intersection is 60% to 80% for severe crashes (those that result in one or more fatalities or injuries serious enough to require hospital treatment). Information is included here: http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/intersection/innovative/uturn E. This would assume the preferred alternative involved the installation of a traffic signal. However the identified preferred alternative calls for the construction of a J-turn intersection. Therefore, the investigation into synchronizing traffic lights along SR 332 at this intersection as well as the other two mentioned is outside the scope of this investigation. This request has been provided to INDOT for consideration in future corridor improvements. F. The project does not call for the reduction in travel lanes. There will still be two in each direction along SR 332 and one in each direction along CR 600 W.
22	Greg Smith 9909 W Gallagher Way	Written comment: A. How many rear end crashes per year have occurred at CR 500 W & SR 332? (since signal lighting installed)	Written comment: A. Traffic analysis was conducted pre- and post-signal installation. The RoadHAT 2.0 program was used to compute the Index of Crash

	Yorktown, IN 47396 April 16, 2019 (written comment)	B. The intended design of the curbs thru the center will be mountable for purposes of emergency vehicles (3a) would you like to go over these obstacles with a broken neck or compound leg fracture? Not very comfortable or healthy for the patient (3b) an attractive nuisance for drivers in non-emergency vehicles – regular drivers tempted to circumvent the intended path of travel (3c) also slows down the speed of emergency vehicles and thus delaying arrival at scene of fire or accident as well as the hospital. C. The stoplight idea could be implemented at 600 W & SR 332 just as easily as 500 W & SR 332: 1) cheaper than the "J" turn 2) could also easily be actuated on demand 3) proper signage with a flashing light could give drivers on SR 332 warning of the light about to change – maybe even rumble strips.	Frequency (ICF) and the Index of Crash Cost (ICC). For the pre-signal condition, the ICF at SR 332 and CR 500 West was 2.05 and the ICC was 2.10. In the post-signal condition, the ICF decreased to -0.49 and the ICC decreased to -0.96. This shows a sharp decrease in the more serious (i.e. personal injury) crashes and total crashes. The intersection of SR 332 and CR 500 West averages less than 1 rear end crash per year, but there have been 3 such crashes with the signal. A spike of rear end crashes when a new signal is installed is not unusual and may not necessarily be an indication of a long-term trend. B. Design changes were made after the Preliminary Field Check Meeting with cooperation with emergency service representatives. The mountable curb will allow emergency vehicles to traverse SR 332 without having to use the median U-turns, therefore reducing the effects to their response routes. Also, the amount of distance the motorist would have to travel before making the median U-turn was reduced; the loons were shifted closer to the intersection. The intersection will be signed appropriately notifying motorists of the crossing restriction to non-emergency vehicles. Local and state law enforcement will be responsible for patrolling SR 332. This would include the illegal crossing of the mountable curbs by non-emergency vehicles. This is the same principle that applies to who will keep motorists from speeding through a yellow or red light at a signalized intersection. C. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs.
23	Brian Huffman 5220 N CR 500 W Muncie, IN 47304	<u>Written comment:</u> A. The ONLY safe passage over an intersection is an overpass, which, using your terminology, eliminates "conflict points." I strongly urge you to consider an	<u>Written comment:</u> A. Based on current traffic volumes and due to associated cost and impacts, an interchange at this location is not warranted at this time.

	April 16, 2019 (written comment)	interstate style exchange as the only viable solution in an area bound for commercial growth. Give us what you would want.	
24	Susan Smith 9909 W. Gallagher Way Yorktown, IN 47396 April 16, 2019 (written comment)	Written comment: A. I feel a J-intersection would be confusing and dangerous to people unfamiliar to how the intersection works. B. A stoplight that only impedes traffic on 332 when there are cars waiting for entrance from 600 W seems the most logical to me.	Written comment: A. The intersection will be constructed with adequate traffic signs and pavement markings to indicate the appropriate maneuvering at the intersection and navigate motorists. In addition, lighting will be provided at the intersection to provide better visibility at night. B. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs.
25	Mike Grieves 2410 S Vine Yorktown, IN April 16, 2019 (written comment)	Written comment: A. Everyone understands a stoplight.	Written comment: A. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs.
26	Anonymous April 9, 2019 (written comment)	Written comment: A. It seems it would be safer if they just made all traffic do a U-turn instead of allowing cars coming from 332 to do a left turn at the intersection.	Written comment: A. A reasonable expectation of positive safety effect of a J-Turn intersection is 60% to 80% for severe crashes (those that result in one or more fatalities or injuries serious enough to require hospital treatment). Information is included here: http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/intersection/innovative/uturn
27	Anonymous	Written comment:	Written comment:

	April 9, 2019 (written comment)	A. Large vehicles (i.e. semi tractor/trailers, firetrucks, school buses, farm equipment, vehicles pulling trailers) frequently use this intersection. We fear that secondary to the size of some of these vehicles that traffic will actually get backed up from the turn lanes into 332. Also, traffic moves rapidly through that area (probably averaging 65mph), and now you have large vehicles on both sides of the road trying to either cross or merge. If anything is needed there it is a traffic signal.	A. The J-Turn has been engineered to allow vehicles up to 104 feet (ex. triple-semi-trailer) to safely utilize the median U-turn lane. Vehicle queueing within the median U-turn lane is comparable, if not, more than the existing non-signalized left turn lanes. After successfully making the U-turn the larger vehicles will not be immediately forced into the higher-speed travel lanes. Rather, they will have about 600 feet of a designated right-turn lane that drops at CR 600 W in which to accelerate and merge into the through lane.
28	Anonymous April 9, 2019 (written comment)	Written comment: A. I heard you guys are planning on changing the intersection making it difficult for fire and Ems to get where we need to go I've been a firefighter on Gaston for 4 years and we use Yorktown a lot for mutual aid just curious about maybe putting a light up and make it a 4 way stop.	Written comment: A. Design changes were made after the Preliminary Field Check Meeting with cooperation with emergency service representatives. The mountable curb will allow emergency vehicles to traverse SR 332 without having to use the median U-turns, therefore reducing the effects to their response routes. Also, the distance the motorist would have to travel before making the median U-turn was reduced; the loons were shifted closer to the intersection. The installation of traffic signals with turn lanes was investigated as an alternative at this intersection. While this alternative would meet the purpose and need of the project and have comparable impacts to identified wetlands, it results in a Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection that is lower than the preferred. The LOS for the Preferred Alternative is LOS A; the Traffic Signal with Turn Lane Alternative would result in a LOS B. The signal alternative would require the lengthening of turn lanes along each approach of SR 332, as opposed to using an existing highway median. This could require additional right-of-way and additional project costs. Also, converting the intersection to a 4-way stop would worsen traffic operations along SR 332. This alternative was not investigated as it would likely result in the LOS to be lower than D at peak times. This is not a desirable solution and could result in more problems for the intersection.