

# APPENDIX C-4

## Monthly Public Inquiry Reports

	<u>Page</u>
May 16, 2017 .....	1
June 12, 2017 .....	2
July 11, 2017 .....	5
August 8, 2017 .....	6
September 5, 2017 .....	10
October 3, 2017 .....	14
November 14, 2017 .....	16
December 12, 2017 .....	20
January 9, 2018 .....	21
February 6, 2018 .....	22
March 5, 2018 .....	24
April 3, 2018 .....	30
May 2018 .....	34
June 12, 2018 .....	35
July 10, 2018 .....	38

**Clarification Note for Central Alternative 1:**

Central Alternatives 1A and 1B as described in the DEIS are physically the same alternative. The only difference between them is that Central Alternative 1A would include tolls on both the new I-69 bridge and on the US 41 bridge. Central Alternative 1B would only include tolls on the new I-69 bridge. Any reference in this document to Central Alternative 1 applies to both Central Alternative 1A and Central Alternative 1B.



---

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** I-69 ORX Project Team

**From:** Public Involvement Team

**Date:** May 16, 2017

**Subject:** Resident inquiries through May 12, 2017

---

As expected, the Project Team fielded questions or feedback from nearly 100 residents following the public launch of I-69 ORX. This feedback was received via phone, visits to the project offices, email, mail and surveys. There are currently no inquiries or responses outstanding.

- 1) Sixty-two surveys have been submitted, including:
  - 49 turned in at one of the public meetings
  - 13 responses mailed to one of the project offices
- 2) Eight residents have called the project hotline (fielded at either office).
- 3) Fifteen individuals have sent questions and/or comments to the [info@I69OhioRiverCrossing.com](mailto:info@I69OhioRiverCrossing.com) email address. All have received a response.
- 4) Nine have visited one of the project offices.
- 5) Three requests have been received for small-group presentations.

The comprehensive list of questions and comments, including the Project Team's response, is available on the Public Inquiry tab on SharePoint.



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** I-69 ORX Project Team

**From:** Public Involvement Team

**Subject:** Analysis of Public Comments Received May 1 to 31, 2018

---

In May 2018 and during the Community Conversations, the I-69 Ohio River Crossing Project Team received 48 comments and/or questions from residents and key stakeholders. Four people called, three people visited the project offices, four provided substantial comments on Facebook, seven emailed, and 30 provided feedback via mail or at one of the Community Conversations.

### Feedback Topics:

Comments and questions focused on the alternatives, their impacts to property and tolling. Below is the breakdown of the focus of their communication:

- 26 asked questions or provided feedback on one or more of the alternatives
- 3 provided comments about the future of the US 41 bridges
- 9 inquired about potential impacts to property
- 1 wanted basic information about the project
- 9 provided feedback about tolling

Following is a representative sample of the feedback received during May. All comments are available in the Public Inquiry Log on SharePoint.

### Comments about the Alternatives:

- Can you use the northern part of West Alternative 1 from US 41/Veterans Memorial Parkway to John James Audubon State Park, and the south part of West Alternative 2 from John James Audubon State Park to US 60, avoiding disturbing the US 41 business district and eliminating both US 41 bridges, making it safe to cross the Ohio River and Keeping all the businesses along US 41 in Henderson?
- I absolutely oppose West Alternatives 1 and 2. The negative impacts of this corridor cannot be replaced within the county. The negative impacts to the budgets of both the Henderson County Fiscal Court and the City of Henderson due to a loss of tax base are significant and outrageous.
- I think a completely new six-lane bridge is the best option.
- Central Alternative 1 is less money and number of people displaced.
- Central Alternative 1 certainly has my vote as the obvious choice. It will spur economic development and jobs. It will potentially alleviate some flooding issues that plague Henderson.



## MEMORANDUM – May 2018 Public Inquiries – June 12, 2018

---

- No build. With all the pension crises you can't afford any more bills.
- Central Corridor 1 is the only wise choice. People work, shop and visit both states, sometimes more than once a day, and should have a separate way of travel.
- Central Alternative 1 is so important to the future growth of Henderson.
- While I was originally focused on Central Alternative 1, I now think West Alternative 1 makes the most sense for Henderson's future. Infrastructure and tax basis will be best protected.
- I personally feel that Central Alternative 1 is the best choice for now and in the future.
- I support the selection of Central Alternative 1. I believe this route will save a lot of time and money during construction due to less relocation of homes and businesses, and will also leave an alternative crossing for local traffic during and after construction.
- I support Central Alternative 1. Mainly because of the cost savings benefits.
- Why can't Waterworks Road be rerouted to the I-69 interchange at the horse park? That rerouting would leave the fireworks business and truck business alone.
- As a resident who lives in the county near to Central Alternative 1, I would prefer the traffic stay near the strip on Highway 41.
- Extend KY 1539 to Wathen Lane.
- Central Alternative: the further out, the more room for Henderson to grow.
- Use Central Corridor route, avoid Henderson strip.

### Comments about Tolling:

- Tolls will be counterproductive to the entire purpose of I-69. If both bridges have tolls, it will hurt businesses on both sides of the river.
- I expressed the need for a toll-free option for local traffic as part of any final tolling plan.
- I am writing to suggest that any further discussion of tolling on the new I-69 bridge be suspended, and that the discussion instead be wrapped into the formal, statewide plan for tolling that was called for in House Enrolled Act 1002.
- Tolls are actually a great idea. In many tolling areas, local residents are able to get a yearly or semiannual pass for a much lower rate.
- Please consider Sun Pass for your tolls.
- Don't like the toll for those of us on fixed incomes.
- If we have to pay tolls, don't even bother.
- Toll new bridge and existing bridges if necessary.

### Comments about the US 41 Bridges:

- The Tri-State area needs both the US 41 bridges to connect to Nashville and the I-69 bridge.
- The US 41 bridge should be free to local traffic.
- Please keep one existing bridge open to local traffic.
- In case of emergency, we need more than one way to cross the river.



**Comments about the Environment**

- I have a major concern regarding wildlife corridors being integrated. Wildlife corridors need to be integrated in and can be combined with the water flow corridors. This would benefit Henderson in promoting themselves as a wildlife destination.





## MEMORANDUM

**To: I-69 ORX Project Team**

**From: Public Involvement Team**

**Date: July 11, 2017**

**Subject: Analysis of Public Comments Received June 1 to 30, 2017**

---

In June there were 50 public comments and inquiries regarding the I-69 Ohio River Crossing (ORX) project. The feedback was received via phone, visits to the project offices, email and mail.

Between June 1 and 13, the team received no inquiries. Visits to the project office, emails and calls picked up significantly after the Notice of Survey letters were mailed to property owners. There was also an uptick in inquiries after the media coverage of the ribbon cuttings for the project offices. There are no outstanding inquiries.

- Twenty-seven individuals called or visited the project offices regarding the Notice of Survey letters. Several calls were from individuals who own or manage several properties in the project area and wanted specific addresses of where the surveying will take place.
- Six residents visited the office or called to ask about viewing the project map.
- Four provided feedback about one or more of the alternatives.
- Six emailed to seek additional information about one or more of the advisory committees.
- The others visited to see the project office, wanted information for the Project Team, etc.

### **Summarized Comments about Alternatives or Tolling**

- The east and two west corridors should be removed from consideration, due to cost and other considerations (environmental, economic, etc.).
- Central 1 is the best option. Keep the Twin Bridges and toll them, plus the new bridge(s).
- A new alternative was proposed. This route would travel due south on Green River Road, then connect to the portion of Central Corridor 2 just north of CSX.

Complete comments can be viewed in the public inquiry log on SharePoint.



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** I-69 ORX Project Team

**From:** Public Involvement Team

**Date:** August 8, 2017

**Subject:** Analysis of Public Comments Received July 1 to 31, 2017

---

In July there were 56 public comments and inquiries regarding the I-69 Ohio River Crossing (ORX) project. The feedback was received via phone, visits to the project offices, email, mail and comment cards completed at the Evansville open house.

- Two individuals visited the project office and one called regarding the notice of survey letters.
- Thirteen residents visited the office or called to view a map and/or ask questions about the project.
- Twenty-seven provided feedback about one or more of the alternatives, including whether to keep the existing US 41 bridges in service.
- Two RCAC members emailed to seek additional information about the public open houses.
- Four individuals wanted more information about MBE/DBE participation.
- Six had questions or suggestions about mitigating potential impacts to the environment.
- Several individuals wanted more specific information about the potential right of way impacts of each corridor.

### Comments about Alternatives or Tolling

- US 41 bridges and/or need for redundant crossing:
  - I feel it is imperative to have 2 sets of bridges over the Ohio River of Evansville. If one set is down for repairs, crashes, natural disasters or bridge injury, it would be a major inconvenience to cross at Owensboro and dangerous.
  - I think for safety sake you need to keep the existing bridge from Evansville to Henderson and build a new one for 69.
  - My vote is to remove one bridge on US 41. Replace with double decker 3 lane span.

- Evansville/Henderson metro area needs another bridge crossing. Need that for safety and traffic alternative. Look at all the bridges in Louisville, New Albany, Jeffersonville.
- Central Corridor #1 makes the most sense for several reasons: lowest construction costs, least disruptive during construction to homes, businesses, traffic, least impact on existing businesses & residents, it creates 2 crossing options rather than one and the road will feel less congested since 41 traffic will continue.
- Most important is another bridge. If something would happen, either by man or nature to a new bridge (west corridor 1&2) and shut down the only bridge, just even for a day or for years, would have a major impact on this area.
- There is also a safety factor, a new bridge (& leave 1 of the existing bridges open).
- The news that two of the corridors would lead to the closure of the 1 twin ridges came as a shock. I think the initial announcement didn't address the concerns about losing hopes for redundancy.
- We must keep both the HWY 41 bridges!
- [Central Corridor 1] allows for the continued use of the current twin bridges. The 69 BridgeLink board feels this additional option of travel between Indiana and Kentucky is a critical safety and social needs.
- We feel that allowing local traffic to cross the twin bridges for free is critical to making the case for tolling the new I-69 bridge.
- West Corridors 1 and 2:
  - With the number of homes and families that will be affected with Corridors West 1 & 2, there is not enough affordable housing in Henderson for them to be located in Henderson.
  - If they go with the West Corridor, we will have the same problems we have now which is having wrecks & maintenance shutting down N-S traffic between Evansville & Henderson.
  - At this point west 1 seems to have the best route that helps businesses in Henderson.
  - The west corridor 2 could be very detrimental to both Eagle Slough & John James Audubon State Park.
  - I prefer the West 1 & West 2 options. I like the inclusion of a trail and think the bridge should also include non-motorized accommodations.
  - The cost of buying all the businesses/residences will escalate the west 1 & west 2 project.



- Central Corridor 1:
  - Central Corridor seems to be the fastest build with least removal of houses & businesses – however, how to make 41 still be viable and not a ghost town seems to be a problem!
  - On behalf of Warrick Chamber is in support of the Central Route #1. It is most effective to build & provides the best option of being built.
  - Central 1 best option for growth and development for the Henderson, KY area.
  - I strongly support the central corridor 1. It will not displace families & homes, as well as not displace businesses.
  - The cost figures that are provided do not include the cost of the new bridge(s) for highway 41 for Central Corridor 1, while those for the 2 west corridors include it. Those costs need to be added to central corridor 1 when evaluating the alternatives. Also, it is listed that central corridor 2 would impact the Green River State Forest. Central corridor 1 would also impact that state forest and should be a consideration.
  - I like central corridor best with keeping the youngest twin bridge.
  - The central corridor #1 route makes the most sense as it saves tax payer dollars upfront.
  - It was stated that no businesses would be affected with central corridor 1. Just a reminder that farming is a business.
  - Since the no build option won't work, we have one choice: central corridor 1.
  - The members of the board of 69 BridgeLink encourages the use of central corridor 1 as the route or the I-69 Ohio River Crossing project.
- East or Central Corridor 2:
  - As to the new bridges, the East Corridor and Central Corridor #2 make the most sense, in that order.
  - The best route would be the East Corridor.
  - Long-term development favors Central Corridor 2.
- Tolling:
  - Toll the new bridge.
  - Important concern about tolls on ALL bridges—impact on those with little income traveling to medical facilities, businesses, churches, etc.
  - I do not believe this short of a segment warrants tolling, outside of obvious revenue generation. Hopefully Indiana & Kentucky can find other funding sources.



- I believe tolling is sensible, having less toll on US41 makes sense, eliminating most truck traffic from US 41 (or tolling them more heavily) would help congestion and long-term maintenance costs.
- We need a toll-free option of the current bridge(s) to remain.
- Tolling is a key piece to funding a project of this size and we are ready to help make the case for it.

Complete comments can be viewed in the public inquiry log on SharePoint.



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** I-69 ORX Project Team

**From:** Public Involvement Team

**Date:** September 5, 2017

**Subject:** Analysis of Public Comments Received August 1 to 31, 2017

---

In August, there were 85 public comments and inquiries regarding the I-69 Ohio River Crossing (ORX) project. The feedback was received via phone, visits to the project offices, email, mail and comment cards collected at the Henderson open house.

- Twenty-nine provided feedback about one or more of the alternatives.
- Seven provided feedback about the future of the existing US 41 bridges.
- Four provided their opinions about tolling.
- Eight asked for copies of the materials distributed at the open houses, including the Screening Report.
- Forty-one individuals wrote about potential impacts to Eagle Slough and other natural resources.
- Two requested presentations for their organizations.

A sampling of the comments received follows.

### Comments about Alternatives

- West Corridor 1:
  - Two of the routes under consideration for the I-69 western corridor would have a significant detrimental impact to Eagle Slough.
  - Both of the west corridor choices have too many environmental impacts on well-established wildlife ears such as the Eagle Slough Natural Area.
  - I believe going to the west 1 route (even though it could be the most expensive route) keep Henderson in the economic race with the interstate and not hiding the Henderson strip from I-69 is a major plus.
  - West Corridor 1 appears to the have the least environmental impacts in comparison with the other two identified.



- I am totally against displacing 300 homes.
- West Corridor 1 and 2 will cause too much disruption and economic loss for badness and for people.
- I favor more business instead of residential: west corridor 1.
- I don't believe the west corridors are in the best interest of our community. No matter which corridor is chosen, the results would be devastating to the Henderson residents and its business district.
- The remaining home owners would likely see reduced property values which would lead to less property tax for local government. The people displaced from their homes will have a hard time finding new homes, since there is already a housing shortage in the area.
- I can see the value of not bypassing the Henderson business strip if one of the West Corridors is chosen.
- West Corridor 2:
  - Both of the west corridor choices have to may environmental impacts on well-established wildlife area such as the Eagle Slough Natural Area.
  - West Corridor 1 and 2 will cause too much disruption and economic loss for badness and for people.
  - I don't believe the west corridors are in the best interest of our community. No matter which corridor is chosen, the results would be devastating to the Henderson residents and its business district.
  - West 2 is what I would advocate, least disruptive to the residential area. I am encouraged by the effort to minimize impacts to parks and nature preserves as well as to historically significant structures.
- Central Corridor 1:
  - I am for the central corridor 1. It will not impact homes and business and destroy them as the west corridors will. Central Corridor 1 is our desired route. Our reasons include safety, residential relocations, property devaluation, complexity and cost, and economics.
  - I would prefer the use of Central Corridor 1 for the following reasons: low construction cost, fewest residential areas, does not alter US 41 traffic on twin bridges, does not impact US 41 commercial district in Henderson, could remove truck traffic off twin bridges and limited environmental impact.
  - If Central Corridor 1 is ultimately selected, noise barriers must be places at the Broxton Park subdivision.



- I feel taking the central 1 route could be a bad economical decision in the long run for Henderson.
- The Central Corridor would cause a serious storm water problem. All water in that section of the county and city will be channeled to Canoe Creek which goes through the City of Henderson.
- A Central Corridor would make the most sense because it will be cheaper to build, remove only a small number of homes and no businesses will be lost, be considerably less disruptive to the Henderson community, and create a redundancy for crossing the Ohio River for convenience, emergency, or catastrophic event.

### Comments about Tolling

- Tearing down and replacing the existing “free” bridges with a TOLL interstate bridge would cripple the economies and have devastating impact on all facets of travel patterns and daily decisions by thousands of Kentucky and Indiana residents.
- If the central corridor is chosen and both sets of bridges are tolled, please consider less toll on 41 bridge to encourage visitors.
- Maintain old bridges with a toll.
- A small toll on the twin bridges could also be put in place to help offset maintenance cost (at current vehicle counts every 25-cent toll would generate around 4 million dollars per year).

### Comments about Future of US 41 Bridges

- I think getting rid of the twin bridges would be a huge mistake.
- This region needs an additional crossing, not a replacement.
- We need to maintain US 4 bridges as well as a new I-69 bridge.
- Most cities with a major river to cross next to them have more than one bridge to keep business few moving along.
- I can't see any reason to choose a path that would eliminate the twin bridges. With no semi or greatly reduced semi traffic on twin bridges, that should prolong their life greatly.
- I most definitely want to retain the 1965 span of the Twin Bridges, preferably with no tolling. It would be optimal to retain both Twin Bridges and use the 1932 span solely for pedestrians, cyclists and mopeds.



- If heavy truck traffic was diverted to the new bridge only, these costs should be reduced and lengthen the life of the twin bridges. A small toll on the twin bridges could also be put in place to help offset maintenance costs.
- I favor taking both of the old twin bridges out of service and totally replacing them with a new six lane interstate bridge.

#### **Comments about Impacts to Eagle Slough and other Natural Resources**

- Wetlands are vital to wildlife and by extension to our own well-being.
- More than a thousand people visit Eagle Slough every year for hiking, birdwatching, exercise, recreation, and environmental education.
- Eagle Slough's unique educational trail, raised boardwalk pathway, and recent rebuild viewing deck make it a valuable resource to the community.
- I'm writing to ask the committee to keep in mind the severe environmental impacts of building a highway.
- Allowing for places where people can observe and enjoy the beauty of our state shouldn't come second to the important work of making access to our state easier and more efficient.
- The western corridor presents a potential noise and fragmentation threat to Eagle Slough and to Audubon Park.
- The central corridor route fragments the green River state forest and results in the loss of important habitat, including the Indiana Brown Bat habitat.
- I was distressed to see that two of the three options for a new bridge across the Ohio River would cross over the environmentally sensitive areas of Eagle Slough Natural Area and John James Audubon State Park.

Complete comments can be viewed in the public inquiry log on SharePoint.



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** I-69 ORX Project Team

**From:** Public Involvement Team

**Date:** October 3, 2017

**Subject:** Analysis of Public Comments Received September 1 to 30, 2017

---

In August, there were 32 public comments and inquiries regarding the I-69 Ohio River Crossing (ORX) project. The feedback was received via phone, visits to the project offices, email and mail.

- Twenty-one encouraged the Project Team to select Central Corridor 1 as the preliminary preferred alternative. They encouraged keeping a redundant crossing and tolling the new bridge as part of the financial solution.
- Three provided their opinions about need for a redundant crossing over the Ohio River.
- Three had questions about whether their/their client's property might directly be impacted by one or more of the alternatives.
- Three individuals wrote about potential impacts to Eagle Slough and other natural resources.
- One asked for clarification about the maps on the website.

A sampling of the comments received follows.

### Comments about Central Corridor 1

- I believe they have shown that Central Corridor 1 has a significant cost savings from the original route laid out in the Draft Environmental Statement of 2004 by cutting down on the number of miles of new terrain needed for the project and the need for fewer interchanges.
- Completing the bridge project using the Central Corridor 1 route in a timely manner is essential to the future competitiveness and financial viability of our plant and this region.
- It seems to be less invasive of personal homes as well as businesses.





- The proposed bridge should be a new "additional" crossing, not a replacement. The highway could not support additional traffic and we would not grow economically. This area is land locked. Break new territory.
- The only option of the 3 that fulfills the project purpose and needs is Central Corridor 1. Ideally, that corridor would be extended to tie into KY 425 or the Audubon Parkway to serve as a true bypass which would further reduce congestion and increase safety on the US Hwy 41 strip in Henderson and Evansville.

#### **Comments about Redundancy**

- Like the BridgeLink board, I feel this additional option of travel between Indiana and Kentucky is a need. Should one or both of the twin bridges fall out of use, the economic impact on the region would be devastating to both states.
- [Construct] not just an additional crossing, but one that creates a true bypass for heavy goods transport. This would get them off the Evansville and Henderson "strips" which is both safer and more efficient for everyone.

#### **Comments about Tolling:**

- I am also in support of tolling as a key piece of the funding of this project while keeping a "free route" for local travel. Tolling is a key piece to funding a project of this size and I know that BridgeLink is prepared to help make the case for it.

#### **Comments about Impacts to Eagle Slough and other Natural Resources**

- I understand that all routes will upset some people, but I can't image affecting Audubon State Park or Eagle Slough. I strongly oppose West Corridors 1 and 2.
- While an additional bridge crossing for I069 in Evansville is necessary, any chosen path should avoid natural areas that provided needed habitats for Indiana's native and endangered species. Two of the paths that are still under consideration will cross Eagle Slough Natural Area.
- Eagle Slough is a rare wetland and mature bottomland forest, home to over 160 species of bird, as well as amphibian and reptile species that are a part of complete food-webs.

Complete comments can be viewed in the public inquiry log on SharePoint.



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** I-69 ORX Project Team

**From:** Public Involvement Team

**Date:** November 14, 2017

**Subject:** Analysis of Public Comments Received October 1 to 31, 2017

---

In October, there were 15 public comments and inquiries regarding the I-69 Ohio River Crossing (ORX) project. The feedback was received via phone, visits to the project offices, email, mail and social media.

- Six provided comments about Central Corridor 1. Five of those encouraged the Project Team to select Central Corridor 1 as the preliminary preferred alternative. This includes proclamations from the cities of Evansville and Henderson, and Henderson County.
- One supported West Corridor 1.
- Two provided input into bridge design and/or aesthetics.
- Two had questions about whether their/their client's property might directly be impacted by one or more of the alternatives.
- One questioned why tolling is being considered for the project when the State of Indiana recently passed a major road funding bill.
- Three were survey responses from RCAC or EJ Subcommittee members.

A sampling of the comments received follows.

### Comments about Central Corridor 1

- Central Corridor 1 seems like the logical choice to me.
- The biggest worry I see with Central Corridor 1, and why I had initially preferred Central Corridor 2, is the addition of entering / exiting traffic between US 60 and Hwy 351 (Zion Rd) on the US 41 corridor. That section of US 41 is heavily used for local traffic movement between US 60 and Hwy 351. It would be better to merge that I-69 traffic south of Hwy 351 for additional safety.
- On behalf of Deaconess Health System, I am writing this letter to encourage the use of central corridor 1 as the route for the Ohio River Bridge Project. This route



allows for the continued use of the current twin bridges. Like the BridgeLink board, I believe this additional option of travel between Indiana and Kentucky is a need. Should one or both of the twin bridges fall out of use, the economic impact on the region would be devastating to both states. I am also in support of tolling as a key piece of the funding of this project while keeping a "free route" for local travel.

- [Background: Evansville city council unanimously voted to support a proposed route for the I-69 Ohio River Crossing Project.] Council members say they support Central Corridor 1. This is the same route that Henderson City Council backs, as well as BridgeLink.
- City of Henderson: Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the City of Henderson, on the basis of the following reasons:
  - Saving taxpayer dollars;
  - Less disruption to existing residences and businesses;
  - Expediency in the time to construct;
  - Reduction of disruption during construction; and
  - Provision of alternative river crossing routes to serve the region's emergency, safety, and economic interests,

Hereby support the selection of Central Corridor 1 as the path for a new I-69 Ohio River crossing, while preserving an alternative crossing of at least one of the existing twin bridges without tolls.

- Henderson County: Now, therefore, be it resolved, the Henderson County Fiscal Court, on the basis of the following reasons:
  - Saving taxpayer dollars;
  - Less disruption to existing residences and businesses;
  - Expediency in the time to construct;
  - Reduction of disruption during construction; and
  - Provision of alternative river crossing routes to serve the region's emergency, safety, and economic interests,

Hereby support the selection of Central Corridor 1 as the path for a new I-69 Ohio River crossing, while preserving an alternative crossing of at least one of the existing twin bridges without tolls.

- Central Corridor 1 joins into the U.S. 41 strip and very close to the U.S. 60 Cloverleaf. It would still leave the strip as one of the main gas, food, lodging exits when people are traveling through. It's another reason that Central Corridor





1 is the most desirable because it keeps U.S. 41 in play as a place for visitors to spend money.

#### **Comments about West Corridor 1**

- The best and only choice is West Corridor 1.

#### **Comments about Bridge Design or Aesthetics:**

- A design suggestion for navigation, safety, and economic considerations, build the bridge with no piers within the normal levels of water in the river. This would negate the chances of a barge striking the bridge.
- I drove across the bridge near Owensboro on Highway 231. How about using that design at Henderson? It is a beauty of a bridge

#### **Comments about Funding:**

- With the currently active construction on I-69 being in Morgan County, this may indicate that I-69 is already being funded with the new gas tax funds.
- On a separate point in the funding discussion, I would like to point out that from its inception I-69 has been described as a "Corridor of the Future", that will "extend from Mexico to Canada", "a primary north-south artery for movement of goods and services in the US". I find it highly contradictory that now, when we suggest that this "through traffic" pay for the new bridge through targeted tolls (and not local area residents who have been crossing the river for free for generations, and who are already paying for highway improvements through the new gas tax) we are told that the "through traffic" is almost insignificant. I suggest you recheck your traffic forecasts, particularly the future forecasts based on a completed I69 through Indianapolis.

#### **Comments from RCAC and EJ Subcommittee Members:**

- I want to make sure from an Emergency Management standpoint that we are maximizing the discussion on the needs of the region as this potential bridge it built to ensure we are not selling anything short. I just worry about this vital link especially when the area is hit by an earthquake or other unforeseen natural disaster.
- I am still concerned that the use of "Open Houses" where the information is directed from project managers/engineers to the public does not adequately address public concerns that would be better understood by having a formal



comment period and a public hearing where those comments are formally included in the EIS.

- Overall, it seems to me like most of the decisions have already been made and this whole exercise is designed to simply reinforce those already made decisions.
- Tolling issues also seem to be set in stone and do not adequately address the problem poor people will have if they are required to cross the river twice a day for employments.

Complete comments can be viewed in the public inquiry log on SharePoint.





## MEMORANDUM

**To:** I-69 ORX Project Team

**From:** Public Involvement Team

**Date:** December 12, 2017

**Subject:** Analysis of Public Comments Received November 1 to 30, 2017

---

In November, only two individuals contacted the I-69 Ohio River Crossing (ORX) Project Team. One inquiry was via phone and one occurred at the project office.

- One individual asked for directions on how to continue on I-69 through the region. We explained that U.S. 41 provides the connection for the interstate in both Indiana and Kentucky.
- One wanted to know if we had an update on land acquisition and asked for INDOT's land acquisition booklets.

Complete entries can be viewed in the public inquiry log on SharePoint.



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** I-69 ORX Project Team

**From:** Public Involvement Team

**Date:** January 9, 2018

**Subject:** Analysis of Public Comments Received December 1 to 31, 2017

---

In December five individuals contacted the I-69 Ohio River Crossing (ORX) Project Team. One inquiry was via email, one on Facebook and three occurred at the project office.

- One individual expressed general concerns about the west corridors.
- One had heard that the Central Corridor had already been selected. He was assured that was not the case, given the current maps and progress handout, and encouraged to attend the February open houses.
- One noted that the Central Corridor has the support of the local governments. He also supported the Central Corridor and keeping one of the US 41 bridges, and asked the Team to consider removing truck traffic from US 41.
- Two sought general information about the status of the project. They received the current handouts and were encouraged to attend the open houses in February. One of the two said he preferred the East Corridor, which was eliminated from consideration last summer.

Complete entries can be viewed in the public inquiry log on SharePoint.



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** I-69 ORX Project Team

**From:** Public Involvement Team

**Date:** February 6, 2018

**Subject:** Analysis of Public Comments Received January 1 to 31, 2018

---

In January, 16 individuals asked questions or submitted comments to the I-69 Ohio River Crossing (ORX) Project Team. Four people called, 11 commented on the Facebook page and one visited the project office.

- Four wanted information about the February 6 and 7 public open houses.
- One couldn't attend the open houses and requested a meeting with the Project Team.
- Two encouraged the team to provide eight lanes across the river to accommodate for construction and future growth.
- Four supported the Central Alternative.
- One supported the Central Alternative, but favored the extension that Central Corridor 2 provided.
- Three said they opposed tolling.
- Two provided a comment in favor of the East Corridor that was eliminated in July. Another suggested a route even further east than the East Corridor.

### Comments about Capacity:

- Roads need to be built for at least 20 years in the future. If ANY bridges are closed, just another day of terrible traffic. Spending all those millions to keep traffic where it's at now? Unacceptable!!!
- It is a mistake to think that all of the local traffic between Evansville and Henderson will be able to travel with a two-lane bridge while there is a toll bridge for I-69. You'll create congestion and what we need is essentially two 4 lane bridges in this local area to service both interstate and local traffic.

(continued on next page)





#### Comments about Tolling:

- No more tolls anywhere. The government steals enough of Americans' hard earned money.
- Can we not make this a toll bridge please?
- A toll bridge will not help with the bottleneck. People will continue to take the cheaper route.

#### Comments about Central Alternative 1:

- The Henderson strip area has always been a bottleneck for traffic passing through the area. The eastern most (Central 1) corridor looks like it'll send that traffic right on through, and make traveling to and from Henderson much quicker and less congested.
- The east route (Central 1) is obviously the least expensive, and disruptive of the three, and the 41 bridge could remain toll free for locals.
- The East Corridor (Central 1) is the best for the Travelers, Henderson County gets a new bridge across the Green River, and the Ohio River Bridge connects to I-69 near Lloyd Expressway. Evansville-Henderson keeps the Hwy 41 bridges too.
- It is also a mistake to not do the Central Corridor correctly and bring it down to intersect what is now US 41 south of the Hwy 351 interchange. All of that combined traffic merging into that stretch of road between US 60 and Hwy 351 along with the use of that stretch as local traffic uses it between US 60 and Hwy 351 will be a recipe for many collisions.

Complete entries can be viewed in the public inquiry log on SharePoint.



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** I-69 ORX Project Team

**From:** Public Involvement Team

**Subject:** Analysis of Public Comments Received February 1 to 28, 2018

---

In February 2018, the I-69 Ohio River Crossing Project Team received 209 points of communication from residents and key stakeholders. Eight people called, 18 people visited the project offices, 13 commented on Facebook, 19 filled out comment cards, 13 emailed and 138 filled out the open house survey (online or via hard copy).

For the purposes of this report, feedback and questions have been divided into two groups: those who responded to the open house survey and those who submitted questions and comments via more traditional methods.

### Open House Survey Responses:

- 1) Which of the following best describes your interest in the I-69 Ohio River Crossing Project?
  - 72% live in the area.
  - 11% live elsewhere, but cross the existing US 41 bridges frequently.
  - 17% cross the US 41 bridges infrequently, but are interested in the project.
- 2) Do you or your family own property along any of the preliminary alternatives being considered?
  - 30% said yes
  - 70% said no
- 3) If you answered yes, which preliminary alternatives could affect your property?
  - 27% answered West Alternative 1
  - 2% answered West Alternative 2
  - 48% answered Central Alternative 1
- 4) Please rank each of the preliminary alternatives in order of preference from 1 to 3:  
First choice:
  - 74% for Central Alternative 1
  - 19% for West Alternative 1
  - 5% for West Alternative 2

Second choice:

- 37% for West Alternative 1
- 33% for West Alternative 2
- 9% for Central Alternative 1

Third choice:

- 39% for West Alternative 2
- 23% for West Alternative 1
- 14% for Central Alternative 1

- 5) What concerns, if any, do you have about each preliminary alternative? Note: This is a summary of the responses. Full-text versions of these answers are available in the Public Inquiry Log on SharePoint.

Top answers for West Alternative 1:

- 49% - Impacts to homes
- 36% - Impacts to businesses
- 20% - Disruption of traffic on strip
- 9% - Eliminating one of the US 41 bridges
- 5% - Congestion during construction

Top answers for West Alternative 2:

- 39% - Impacts to businesses
- 36% - Removing US 41 bridges from service
- 18% - Impacts to homes
- 16% - Disruption of traffic on strip
- 6% - Tolling all cross-river traffic

Top answers for Central Alternative 1:

- 28% - No concerns
- 16% - Bypasses the US 41 strip
- 18% - Impacts to the environment or historic sites
- 8% - Eliminating one of the US 41 bridges
- 6% - Impacts to farmland

- 6) Do you have any suggestions for improving the preliminary alternatives?

West Alternative 1

- 33% - Eliminate it
- 17% - Keep both US 41 bridges in service
- 12% - Use the US 41 bridge not in service for bicycle/pedestrian access

West Alternative 2

- 33% - Eliminate it
- 21% - Keep at least one of the US 41 bridges in service
- 10% - Minimize impacts to businesses
- 6% - Eliminate tolling
- 4% - Add more exits

Central Alternative 1:

- 22% - No suggestions
- 18% - Keep both US 41 bridges in service
- 17% - Keep a free option for locals
- 6% - Eliminate tolling
- 6% - Included bicycle/pedestrian facility

- 7) If West 2 is the preferred alternative in the DEIS, how would the removal of both US 41 bridges from service affect you and the community?
- 30% - There would not be an alternative if construction, accidents, etc. closed the I-69 bridge
  - 17% - There would be more congestion through Henderson
  - 15% - Tolls would cause financial hardship
  - 15% - No effect
  - 7% - It would hurt businesses and the community as a whole
- 8) Tolling the new I-69 bridge, existing US 41 bridge or both will be considered for funding the new bridge. How do you think tolling would affect your household?
- 32% - Would not impact it
  - 19% - Would hurt family finances
  - 15% - Trips between cities would be cancelled, or rerouted through Owensboro
  - 6% - Need more information on the amount of the toll
- 9) Six lanes of cross-river capacity are needed based on long-term statewide and local traffic forecasts. An I-69 bridge must be a minimum of 4 lanes. Do you prefer retaining one US 41 bridge for local traffic (West 1 and Central 1), or do you prefer a 6-lane I-69 bridge (West 2). Why?
- 71% - Retain one US 41 bridge
  - 31% - Keep both US 41 bridges and build a new I-69 bridge
  - 6% - Remove both US 41 bridges from service

**Feedback via Traditional Methods:**

Many people submitted comments about various topics. Below is the breakdown of the focus of their communication:

- 25 commented on the alternatives
  - Central 1 received 16 comments in favor and 2 against
  - West 1 received 1 comment in favor and 2 against
  - West 2 received 1 comment in favor and 4 against
- 15 inquired about potential impacts to their property
- 15 wanted basic information about the project or requested open house materials
- 13 wanted at least one of the US 41 Twin Bridges to remain in service
- 7 commented about impacts to the environment or historic properties
- 5 commented about tolling
- 4 asked the team to include bicycle/pedestrian access in the preferred alternative

Following is a representative sample of the feedback received during February. All comments are available in the Public Inquiry Log on SharePoint.

**Comments about the Alternatives:**

West Alternative 1:

- We are highly in favor of one of the two west routes. We feel if you go with the east route, Henderson will become a ghost town; nobody will stop.
- The West Alternatives seem so close to the Audubon State Park.

West Alternative 2:

- We are highly in favor of one of the two west routes. We feel if you go with the east route, Henderson will become a ghost town; nobody will stop.
- The West Alternatives seem so close to the Audubon State Park.
- I don't like this one at all.
- This is the worst of the three alternatives. It eliminates many more businesses and homes than the others, and it leaves us with no alternative route when something happens to shut down a bridge.

Central Alternative 1:

- The Central Alternative is by far better than the other two, but a little bit east of the central might be better.
- You guys need to rethink before assuming two lanes for each direction. If you happen to decide to add more lanes in the future, this would have created some chaos for everyone.
- Central Alternative is the one. Go ahead and build a six-lane I-69 bridge now.

- Timeline is beyond crazy. Build the new bridge on Central 1 already!
- The Henderson strip will become “Radiator Springs” (reference to the dusty town on the cartoon movie Cars), businesses will move to exits on the new I-69.
- Central Alternative 1 is by far the best of the remaining three options. Besides leaving one of the twin bridges open for traffic, it only affects two houses and zero businesses.
- Why isn’t there an exit for Waterworks Road?
- Please put a four-leaf clover intersection on Central Alternative 1. This will allow access to Evansville’s south side, an economically challenged area that would benefit from greater access.
- Central Alternative 1 makes sense for future growth.
- Central Alternative 1 takes a camp property that’s been in my family since 1943.

**Comments about the US 41 Bridges:**

- There is no way that two lanes on the non-toll bridge will be enough.
- They need to have both bridges: existing US 41 and new bridge. Traffic is already too heavy on twin bridges and if there’s an accident or a barge hits it, there needs to be an alternative.
- Keep BOTH twin bridges in use.
- I don’t understand the push for closing down one of the twin bridges. There’s no reason not to keep them both open.
- US 41 bridges should remain four lanes, two lanes each direction.

**Comments about the Environment:**

- I understand the need for the river crossing and I support it. Please look for a way to build the overpass and keep the wetland intact.
- I want to express my grave concerns about the options that could impact the Eagle Slough Natural Area and, further south, Audubon State Park.

**Tolling:**

- I am interested to know how the project will be funded. Will it be a public-private partnership with tolling?
- Toll it all if necessary.
- You must place the toll on all bridges. The locals will travel the bridge that does not have an assessment and create an unequal distribution of the traffic load.
- No tolling of existing bridges due to EJ impacts.

**Bicycle/Pedestrian Access:**

- When you build it, make it wide enough for pedestrian travel.
- It would be nice to use the decommissioned twin bridge for a pedestrian/bike path connecting Evansville and Henderson.





## MEMORANDUM

**To:** I-69 ORX Project Team

**From:** Public Involvement Team

**Subject:** Analysis of Public Comments Received March 1 to 31, 2018

---

In March 2018, the I-69 Ohio River Crossing Project Team received 47 comments and/or questions from residents and key stakeholders. Three people called, seven people visited the project offices, two provided substantial comments on Facebook, one filled out a comment card, eight emailed and 26 filled out the open house survey (online or via hard copy).

### Feedback Topics:

Many people submitted comments about various topics. Below is the breakdown of the focus of their communication:

- 26 filled out all or part of the open house survey, providing feedback about the alternatives, tolling, US 41 bridges and more
- 8 focused on one or more of the alternatives
- 7 inquired about potential impacts to their property
- 5 wanted basic information about the project or requested open house materials
- 3 wanted at least one of the US 41 Twin Bridges to remain in service
- 3 commented or had questions about impacts to the environment or historic properties
- 2 commented about tolling, via email and Facebook
- 1 asked the team to include bicycle/pedestrian access in the preferred alternative

Following is a representative sample of the feedback received during March. All comments are available in the Public Inquiry Log on SharePoint.

### Comments about the Alternatives:

#### West Alternative 1:

- Any neighborhoods left around where West 1 is built would have decreased property values and increased noise pollution. It would be a lot more hassle for everyone concerned (including the government) to buy all the individual residential properties and businesses, then demolish the aforementioned properties to get the area prepared for the interstate.
- The businesses that would be affected are important ones for the tiny city of Henderson. It would be a lot of business and economic impact in the short- and long-term for the City of Henderson.

- I do NOT like this route at all. It is completely illogical to destroy a town to put in an interstate when there is another option that would not destroy any businesses and would only affect one home.

West Alternative 2:

- It would kill the businesses left on the 41 strip. Most of the businesses that we use would move away or die out.
- Ensure adequate means of exiting and entering I-69 so people will stop and patronize the local businesses along the strip area.
- Residents that are left in the area of this project area will have decreased property values and decreased value of living. In the sense, the noise, staring at a wall when they look out their front window, and adverse effects on their houses from construction of the highway.
- It would destroy businesses on 41, financially, if not physically.
- If West Alternative 2 is selected it could be detrimental to our community. It destroys so many homes and a major part of our businesses.
- I do NOT like this route at all. It is completely illogical to destroy a town to put in an interstate when there is another option that would not destroy any businesses and would only affect one home.
- It completely eliminates the bridges that people use daily for work. I drive the Twin Bridges every day and several times have been stuck in Evansville and can't get back home. Having only one bridge to cross with that many people is awful. And currently our only other option is to travel an extra hour through Owensboro.

Central Alternative 1:

- I support the Central Corridor 1 plan for the I-69 bridge and route through Henderson County.
- As a real estate broker who focuses on commercial development, I have seen how retail and other developments will expand when given the opportunity for new transportation corridors.
- I've had an opportunity to see and study the updated design in the proposed connector between the I-69 corridor and the existing US-41 corridor. The 2.2+ mile loop causes the northbound US 41 traffic to have an extremely long route to the US 41 N Strip. Please reconsider that exchange for a tighter and shorter design. The current merchants on the US-41 Strip are very concerned about the difficulty and length of trip in gaining access to the Strip.
- I have no concerns. I believe this to be the best route. I'm sorry if the animal lovers feel that the animals should not be uprooted. What about the people and citizens of Henderson. We are the ones who pay taxes to create these roads - not the animals and birds!!!
- The Central Alternative would be better for everyone concerned (the businesses, families and their homes, the City of Henderson, and the wildlife crossing).



- I believe it will ultimately have a very negative financial impact to the Henderson strip and the city of Henderson. People will essentially just by-pass Henderson all together.
- I was hoping the road would not be so close to Balmoral. Three-tenths of a mile and less is too close. It will lower the value of our homes. Is there any way it could be moved back further? I realize there are two historical homes you are protecting, however, the plan will impact many families.
- I have no concerns about this route. This seems the best solution. It only affects one residence and no businesses at all. It also leaves the Twin Bridge for locals to use as well so if there is a wreck or construction we can still get to work or back home.

**Comments about the US 41 Bridges:**

- We need total Ohio River bridge redundancy between Henderson and Evansville. By that I mean, a complete I-69 bridge as you have designed, but we need both of the current US 41 bridges to stay in operation. To me, that is total bridge redundancy. We need this plan in case of any future accidents or natural disasters.
- Not having a local bridge would kill the 41 Strip.
- I believe it would be wise to retain at least one, if not both of the existing bridges, plus build a new 4-lane bridge for I-69. When wrecks occur, frequently, this causes the shutdown of the bridge, which is very impactful on the local traffic. I believe this decision should be considered independently of the I-69 bridge(s).
- I am in favor of retaining one US 41 bridge for local traffic because that would give local people an easier way to get to Evansville rather than having to drive further to connect with a 6-lane bridge.
- I prefer retaining one of the US 41 bridges to save businesses along US 41 in Henderson.
- Keep one Route 41 bridge for local. Keep the interstate an interstate so the traffic flows and keeps moving!
- I would prefer retention of both US 41 bridges for local traffic. Current traffic patterns are concerning in the event of an accident or lane closure.
- We are in desperate need of a second bridge, not one big one.

**Comments about the Environment or Historic Properties**

- I am very unhappy with the placement of the bridge it crosses many Indian burial grounds and as an Indian myself. I am very unhappy with the corridor placement. It is also passing through an historic trail of Desoto when he came in 1542.
- I am also concerned about the impact of the interstate on the local deer crossing that occur between Watson Ln. and Veterans Memorial Parkway/69. Increased lanes of traffic would mean increased chances of car accidents with deer.

**Comments about Tolling:**

- If there is to be a toll, there should be an end date of deferred costs accounted for.
- I think tolling the new I-69 bridge under this plan would be acceptable, but the tolling of the SB US 41 bridge would be a terrible idea because it would discourage local traffic from going back and forth between Henderson and Evansville.
- Not good for the poor and retirees. If I go 14 times a month or more, it will be \$70 per month at a \$5 toll.
- I prefer both 41 bridges toll-free and a six-lane toll bridge for I-69, if it has to be toll.
- If it can be automated, I don't think it will be a financial burden. If it causes a slowdown to the traffic, it will cause congestion in my area.
- Don't toll the 41 bridge.
- I think if anything is tolled, I'll go to Owensboro instead.
- A no free tolling option will decrease my trips to Henderson. This will have the same impact on households throughout the area. Traffic between the two cities will decrease, and economic activity will be negatively impacted.
- I would be ok with tolling if it's reasonable and the Twin Bridges are left as they are now, in addition to the new I-69 bridge.

**Comments about Bicycle/Pedestrian Access:**

- If this highway project is to be an economic boost, we must portray quality of life to bring business and industry to the area. For this reason I would like to see a pedestrian-bike lane on the bridge that would connect the greenways and trail systems in the area to improve the health and welfare of the citizens.



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** I-69 ORX Project Team

**From:** Public Involvement Team

**Subject:** Analysis of Public Comments Received April 1 to 30, 2018

---

In April 2018, the I-69 Ohio River Crossing Project Team received 26 comments and/or questions from residents and key stakeholders. Eleven people called, one person visited the project offices, two provided substantial comments on Facebook, 10 emailed and two provided feedback at the Mayor's traveling city hall in Evansville. Note: This does not include feedback from the Community Conversations.

### Feedback Topics:

Comments and questions varied widely. Below is the breakdown of the focus of their communication:

- 6 asked questions or provided feedback on one or more of the alternatives or the future of the US 41 bridges
- 4 inquired about the Community Conversations
- 10 inquired about potential impacts to property
- 4 wanted basic information about the project
- 2 asked questions or commented about tolling

Following is a representative sample of the feedback received during April. All comments are available in the Public Inquiry Log on SharePoint.

### Comments about the Alternatives:

- There is no alternative other than Central 1 that me or my family could support. Heavy traffic must be diverted east of the strip on a new bridge leaving local traffic to travel the strip on the old bridge.
- Having made the trip from Evansville to Texas two or four times a year for the last 20 years, I personally feel that the Central Alternative 1 is the best choice for now and in the future.
- Best alternative would be to build I-69 ORX next to US 41 and keep both available. Develop a way that I-69 ORX is essential built about US 41 with exits.
- An official at the Mayor's traveling city hall asked that a boat ramp be included in all the alternatives. This would allow emergency services personnel to reach people quicker at the bridge instead of them traveling to the public dock, then traveling back to the bridge.

### Comments about Tolling:

- Tolling should be considered to make sure the project happens in our lifetime.





## MEMORANDUM

**To:** I-69 ORX Project Team

**From:** Public Involvement Team

**Subject:** Analysis of Public Comments Received May 1 to 31, 2018

---

In May 2018 and during the Community Conversations, the I-69 Ohio River Crossing Project Team received 48 comments and/or questions from residents and key stakeholders. Four people called, three people visited the project offices, four provided substantial comments on Facebook, seven emailed, and 30 provided feedback via mail or at one of the Community Conversations.

### Feedback Topics:

Comments and questions focused on the alternatives, their impacts to property and tolling. Below is the breakdown of the focus of their communication:

- 26 asked questions or provided feedback on one or more of the alternatives
- 3 provided comments about the future of the US 41 bridges
- 9 inquired about potential impacts to property
- 1 wanted basic information about the project
- 9 provided feedback about tolling

Following is a representative sample of the feedback received during May. All comments are available in the Public Inquiry Log on SharePoint.

### Comments about the Alternatives:

- Can you use the northern part of West Alternative 1 from US 41/Veterans Memorial Parkway to John James Audubon State Park, and the south part of West Alternative 2 from John James Audubon State Park to US 60, avoiding disturbing the US 41 business district and eliminating both US 41 bridges, making it safe to cross the Ohio River and Keeping all the businesses along US 41 in Henderson?
- I absolutely oppose West Alternatives 1 and 2. The negative impacts of this corridor cannot be replaced within the county. The negative impacts to the budgets of both the Henderson County Fiscal Court and the City of Henderson due to a loss of tax base are significant and outrageous.
- I think a completely new six-lane bridge is the best option.
- Central Alternative 1 is less money and number of people displaced.
- Central Alternative 1 certainly has my vote as the obvious choice. It will spur economic development and jobs. It will potentially alleviate some flooding issues that plague Henderson.



- No build. With all the pension crises you can't afford any more bills.
- Central Corridor 1 is the only wise choice. People work, shop and visit both states, sometimes more than once a day, and should have a separate way of travel.
- Central Alternative 1 is so important to the future growth of Henderson.
- While I was originally focused on Central Alternative 1, I now think West Alternative 1 makes the most sense for Henderson's future. Infrastructure and tax basis will be best protected.
- I personally feel that Central Alternative 1 is the best choice for now and in the future.
- I support the selection of Central Alternative 1. I believe this route will save a lot of time and money during construction due to less relocation of homes and businesses, and will also leave an alternative crossing for local traffic during and after construction.
- I support Central Alternative 1. Mainly because of the cost savings benefits.
- Why can't Waterworks Road be rerouted to the I-69 interchange at the horse park? That rerouting would leave the fireworks business and truck business alone.
- As a resident who lives in the county near to Central Alternative 1, I would prefer the traffic stay near the strip on Highway 41.
- Extend KY 1539 to Wathen Lane.
- Central Alternative: the further out, the more room for Henderson to grow.
- Use Central Corridor route, avoid Henderson strip.

**Comments about Tolling:**

- Tolls will be counterproductive to the entire purpose of I-69. If both bridges have tolls, it will hurt businesses on both sides of the river.
- I expressed the need for a toll-free option for local traffic as part of any final tolling plan.
- I am writing to suggest that any further discussion of tolling on the new I-69 bridge be suspended, and that the discussion instead be wrapped into the formal, statewide plan for tolling that was called for in House Enrolled Act 1002.
- Tolls are actually a great idea. In many tolling areas, local residents are able to get a yearly or semiannual pass for a much lower rate.
- Please consider Sun Pass for your tolls.
- Don't like the toll for those of us on fixed incomes.
- If we have to pay tolls, don't even bother.
- Toll new bridge and existing bridges if necessary.

**Comments about the US 41 Bridges:**

- The Tri-State area needs both the US 41 bridges to connect to Nashville and the I-69 bridge.
- The US 41 bridge should be free to local traffic.
- Please keep one existing bridge open to local traffic.
- In case of emergency, we need more than one way to cross the river.



**Comments about the Environment**

- I have a major concern regarding wildlife corridors being integrated. Wildlife corridors need to be integrated in and can be combined with the water flow corridors. This would benefit Henderson in promoting themselves as a wildlife destination.





## MEMORANDUM

**To: I-69 ORX Project Team**

**From: Public Involvement Team**

**Date: July 10, 2018**

**Subject: Analysis of Public Comments in June 2018**

---

In June 2018, the I-69 Ohio River Crossing (ORX) Project Team received 30 comments and/or inquiries. Five people called, 16 commented on the Facebook page, six emailed and three visited the project office.

- Eight wanted to know what impacts one or more of the alternatives may have on their property
- Five provided comments about tolling
- Twelve provided feedback about one or more of the alternatives
- Seven commented on the future of the US 41 bridges

Most inquiries were received after the Project Team revealed updates to the preliminary alternatives.

### **Comments about Tolling**

- Tolls would hurt workers both coming and going. Also affect commerce. If I had to pay a toll, I would go to Owensboro.
- Locals should not have to pay tolls to cross those bridges; it should be the travelers of I-69.
- The toll will shift the costs to the consumers via higher priced goods. If gas prices and other prices of goods are going to go up. . .why not just raise the gas tax and pay for the bridge?
- The toll will also force more people to continue to use the 41 route to avoid the toll, which will only cause the toll to be in place longer. Everyone in the communities will benefit in one way or another so everyone should help pay for the bridge.



### Comments about Tolling (cont'd)

- I do not support any additional increases to my expenses to make the commute.
- I agree on the central route as a toll road and vote to keep both twin bridges open, without tolls.

### Comments about the Alternatives

- I still say the Central Alternative is the only one that made sense from the beginning.
- It would seem that using the Central Alternative would do less to mess up Highway 41 and keeping one bridge would really help the locals get back and forth.
- The west ones [alternatives] will shut down the strip as we have it now and cause utter chaos during the build.
- Business will increase with Central Alternative 1. People are reluctant to stop and shop due to the high traffic flow.
- I agree on the central route as a toll road and vote to keep both twin bridges open, without tolls.
- What is taking so long? The only viable option is the Central Alternative option.
- Go east! Why congest the Henderson strip area even more and dislocate so many residents?
- Central 1 should be the only option. Otherwise, you are going to ruin either businesses or actually run out hundreds of families who live in the path of the west corridor.
- I prefer the more easterly options. Intersecting with Audubon Parkway is [a] better option and away from downtown Evansville traffic.
- Personally, I stand strong on my support for [the] Central 1 option. There is far less impact on homes and businesses. I am firm in belief that currently there is far too much through traffic on [the] US 41 strip, which does not stop and only causes fewer people to stop during peak hours.

### Comments about the US 41 Bridges

- Leave the twin bridges both open.
- Keep both twin bridges open and toll free.
- I know they say only six lanes are needed, but if you're going to use six, may as well use eight and keep both US 41 bridges operational.
- Replacing one of the bridges keeps us in the same position we are in now, any accidents in the bridge area cripples traffic for hours on end.



#### Comments about the US 41 Bridges (cont'd)

- Removing both bridges and replacing them with one new six-lane bridge is short-sighted for future I-69 traffic increases; also, if a barge happens to strike the bridge it has to be closed for inspection, which can take many hours.
- I think both current bridges should be kept, but only one lane in use on each bridge to provide a break-down lane.
- We absolutely need two ways to cross the Ohio River between Evansville and Henderson. Many things can shut down a single bridge in one or both directions.
- This area needs two places to cross the river into Indiana instead of one.
- I agree on the Central route as a toll road and vote to keep both twin bridges open, without tolls.

Complete comments can be viewed on the Public Inquiry Log.

