



exception of “D”, neither of the “L” routes performs as well as the other options that connect to SR 37 farther north.

Alternative “L-2” is somewhat more expensive than “L-1”, ranking 12th as opposed to 10th with respect to capital costs. Its O&M costs, however, are less, ranked 9th as opposed to 14th.

4. Route Concept “N”

Alternative “N” is a combination of “L-2” and “M”. Accordingly, its performance is generally consistent with these two routes. Its greatest strength is a 1st place ranking for long-term economic growth and the social distribution of economic benefits. It is also very strong with respect to traffic safety. From the viewpoint of traffic safety, it is virtually tied in 1st place with Alternative “D”. It is ranked 3rd and 4th for national/international transportation and personal accessibility, respectively.

On the other hand, Route “N” has some very low ratings. It is ranked in 18th place for improving the Evansville-Indianapolis travel time connection (a core objective), 18th for monetary user benefits, and 17th place for intermodal accessibility. In terms of capital costs, it is somewhat more expensive than “L-1” and “L-2” (ranked 15th), although its O&M costs are ranked considerably better, in 6th place.

F. The No-Build Alternative

While the No-Build Alternative does nothing to achieve any of the goals of I-69, it also requires no capital outlay for construction and causes no increase in operation and maintenance costs. Over time, it implies increasing costs to society in terms of modest worsening of congestion with associated increases in traffic accidents, travel times, and other related costs. On most of the performance measures, it ranks in last (i.e., 20th) place. Accordingly, it is the benchmark against which the other alternatives are measured.

Interestingly, in addition to capital and O&M costs, there is another category of cost that is not incurred by the No-Build Alternative: namely, increases in vehicle operating costs. All of the “build” alternatives result in a net increase in vehicle operating costs due to higher speeds and an overall increase in vehicle-miles of traffic. For this reason, the No-Build Alternative ranks in 17th place rather than last place in Monetary User Benefits (i.e., Family 5).

G. Alternatives Recommended for Detailed Study

The route concepts have been exhaustively analyzed using a range of analytical methods to assess their ability to meet the various performance measures, while minimizing cost and ensuring geographic diversity in the set of alternatives carried forward for detailed study.

Given the large number of performance measures, as well as the need to consider geographic diversity and cost, there is no single formula or threshold that could be used to determine which alternatives “meet” the purpose and need or which alternatives are “best” overall. Rather, it has been



necessary to examine the alternatives from several different perspectives using a variety of methods, as described briefly in Section V, A above.

The screening process resulted in the selection of the following alternatives for detailed study:

1. Western Group

Within the Western group of alternatives, the following route concepts will be carried forward for detailed study:

- **Alternative 1** (Route Concept “A”) fairly consistently performs better than its major geographic competitor: “E”. While it generally does not have high performance scores, it is at the very low end of the cost spectrum and maintains a high level of support from a significant segment of the public and important stakeholder groups.
- **Alternative 2** (Route Concepts “C-1” and “C-2”) offers reasonably good performance scores and simultaneously combines service to Princeton and Vincennes with elements of a direct route to Indianapolis.

2. Central Group - Bloomington

Within the Central – Bloomington group of alternatives, the following concepts will be carried forward for detailed study:

- **Alternative 3** is based on Route Concepts “F-1” and “F-2,” with an optional connection to Bloomington that would be similar to “H-1” and “H-2.” These options – in particular F2 – consistently deliver high composite performance scores. Option “F-2” is one of only two alternatives that simultaneously makes use of SR 37 and avoids passing through the City of Bloomington, while still serving it. In relative terms, the estimated capital costs of Route Concept “F” are in the low-to-mid-range (among the “build” alternatives). The “H” routes are also strong performers and offer an alternative connection with SR 37.

3. Central Group – Non-Bloomington

- **Alternative 4** is based on Route Concept “J.” It is proposed as a mid-course alternative both geographically and in terms of performance. It also has a comparatively low price tag. While “I” and “J” are quite similar, “J” performs slightly better than “I”. Moreover, it is significantly better than “M”.

4. Eastern Group

- **Alternative 5** is based on Route Concepts “L-1” and “L-2.” These alternatives are the best of the alternatives serving the eastern part of the I-69 Study Area. Overall, it is a good performer with the added feature of improving accessibility to the cities of Bedford and, indirectly, Jasper.



H. Summary

As Table 6 suggests, related route concepts recommended for advancement have been consolidated into alternatives identified by a number. These numbered alternatives are broadly defined in terms of the cities that they connect and the highway corridors that they utilize. They are defined broadly enough to allow for some flexibility in modifying and/or combining sections of related route concepts that have been studied to date. This flexibility may be needed in order to define a preferred corridor that ultimately avoids or minimizes adverse impacts to southwestern Indiana's environmental resources.

For the alternatives that include I-70 or SR 37 optional approaches to the Indianapolis area, the performance measures consistently favor option 2 (i.e., the routing that makes the greatest use of SR 37). However, a normal part of the environmental process involves making modifications as more detailed information becomes available and this may become necessary.

Based on the analysis described in this report and other supportive technical documentation, the following alternatives are recommended for advancement to Level 3. Figure 15 shows the general locations of these alternatives.

- ✓ **Alternative 1: Evansville to Vincennes to Terre Haute to Indianapolis**
- ✓ **Alternative 2: Evansville to Vincennes, then proceeding along the SR 67 corridor to Morgan County with the option of proceeding to I-70 or SR 37 and on to Indianapolis**
- ✓ **Alternative 3: Evansville to Washington, then proceeding along the SR 57 and SR 67 corridors to Morgan County where it diverges from SR 67 and proceeds to I-70 and on to Indianapolis**
- ✓ **Alternative 4: Evansville to Washington, then proceeding to the general Bloomington area and on to Martinsville via SR 37 with the option of using the SR 37 corridor to Indianapolis or deviating off SR 37 to I-70 and on to Indianapolis**
- ✓ **Alternative 5: Evansville to Washington, then proceeding east along the US 50 corridor to Bedford and on to Bloomington and Indianapolis via SR 37**

The No-Build alternative will also be retained for consideration throughout the study.



VI. Where we go from here

We have reached a major milestone in the Evansville-to-Indianapolis Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement. Just as there was a round of public meetings after the last milestone – the draft Purpose and Need – another round of public meetings will be scheduled within the next several weeks to present the findings and recommendations of the Alternatives Analysis and to receive feedback.

Work will now proceed with Level 3 of the tiered environmental study. During this phase, the focus of study will be on refining the alternatives into better-defined corridors. Unlike Level 2, which concentrated on broad regional planning considerations, Level 3 will study in some detail the environmental impacts and issues associated with these corridors.

The next major milestone will be the publication of the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) scheduled for the Spring or Summer of 2002. At that time there will be another round of public meetings, which will serve as the official public hearings for this study. In the meantime, opportunities for ongoing public involvement will continue through the newsletter, the Issues Involvement Team, the project hotline, media communications, and meetings with interested parties.