

Appendix J

Public Participation- Comments and Responses

Public Participation Process

NIRCC and its planning partners engage in a multi-level, multi-agency public participation process offering a variety of opportunities for participation in the transportation planning process. These include outreach meetings, public meetings, open houses, websites, and virtual options.

The following meetings were held and/or attended to share information regarding the transportation planning process, 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, along with other planning and project development meetings directly related to the transportation planning process.

2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Public Outreach Meetings

- May 19, 2022 Northwest Area Partnership
- October 12, 2022 Southeast Area Partnership
- October 19, 2022 Southwest Area Partnership
- November 9, 2022 Southeast Area Partnership
- January 18, 2023 Southwest Area Partnership
- January 19, 2023 Northwest Area Partnership
- February 8, 2023 Southeast Area Partnership
- February 9, 2023 Northeast Area Partnership

NIRCC Open Houses for MTP and TIP

- April 26, 2023
- June 28, 2023
- March 8, 2023 Southeast Area Partnership

Additional Transportation Project Meetings

- Anthony Boulevard Lane Reduction
 - October 18, 2022
 - October 20, 2022

- Goshen Road Project
 - March 30, 2023

- US 30 Corridor Study
 - June 1, 2021
 - February 9, 2022
 - December 15, 2022

- US 30 Planning and Environmental Linkages Study
 - December 5, 2022
 - June 8, 2023
 - June 13, 2023

Comprehensive Plan “All-In Allen” Public Hearing

- Wednesday, October 26, 2022

Comments from the NIRCC Transportation Open House & Comment Period June 6 – July 5, 2023

1) Comment/Question: The buses in Fort Wayne do not seem to have windows. The windows are covered by advertisements. New riders need to be able to see out the window so that they know where their stop is. This was a real issue when I had to take the bus and walked up to the front where I could see out the front window only to fall right into a passenger's lap. I hope you can address the window issue for our city buses.

Response from Citilink: Citilink understands this concern which occasionally comes up from transit riders. The bus wrap advertisements are printed on perforated vinyl which allows visibility from inside the bus during daylight, although the vinyl does reduce visibility through the window, especially when it's dark outside in unlighted areas. Our advertising policy limits the number of wrapped buses in the fleet to 30% of the fleet.

Citilink relies upon advertising revenue to support the operating budget to keep costs of fares for riders as low as possible. If we were to eliminate the bus wrap advertising, then there would be trade-offs with regard to fares. As we plan for future budgetary needs, we will continue to consider the necessity for the advertising program.

Meanwhile, Citilink drivers will assist passengers with finding their destinations. We also provide electronic text displays and audible announcements of major intersections and bus stops on board to assist passengers with finding their stop.

2) Comment/Question: I was able to speak with one of your team members yesterday evening about travel forecasts, which was excellent to understand more about how this process works. Rightsizing sounds like a good approach to limit the emphasis on driving over other transportation options and begin creating safer streets.

As a citizen, I would like to emphasize that these forecasts should consider how transportation modes will need to change, and are changing, to reduce the effects of climate change. This includes individuals opting to use multimodal and active transportation, as well as EV adoption.

These forecasts should also consider how and where people are working in the future, with many people continuing to work remotely.

Response From NIRCC: The planning assumptions and travel forecasts for the transportation plan assume active transportation modes will continue to increase, and electric vehicles will become more prominent. All modes of transportation are supported in the transportation plan and encouraged to support sustainable communities and reduce the effects of climate change. The scope for roadway projects in the transportation plan is based on travel demands, both existing and future, so the infrastructure investment is rightsized. The roadway projects include reconstruction and lane reduction with bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. The planning assumptions and forecasts do consider where

people will work in the future and are aligned with the Comprehensive Land Use Plans. Assessing the long-term trend for remote working is difficult. Many businesses went to working remote work during the pandemic but have gradually returned to the workplace with varying options afforded to employees to work remotely. Indicators such as vehicle miles of travel returning to pre-pandemic levels and the availability of commercial and office space in the region considered limited, we assume the ability to work totally remote for most employees is restricted. Then number of folks working remote will continue to be monitored to determine if the planning assumptions need to be modified. The transportation plan is updated every four to five years so assumptions such as working remote or increased levels of active transportation can be incorporated in the travel forecasts.

3) Comment/Question: How are electric bikes being considered in planning? I am currently budgeting to purchase an electric cargo bike that can travel up to 28mph to replace my car. At the recent public meeting regarding the Broadway/Taylor corridor project, the planners highlighted pedestrians and cyclists sharing a wide sidewalk. Is the NIRCC considering how biking is evolving as a primary mode of transportation, with E-Bike adoption, and providing recommendations to planners on how to handle both pedestrians and cyclists and their unique needs? I feel that there is an assumption currently that bikes/peds do not have unique needs, which differ from cars, as well.

I also was curious about your comment in The Local regarding parking and its impact on bike and pedestrian infrastructure. Are there specific guidelines for parking, specifically on-street parking, in the city that are considered in NIRCC plans? I am an advocate for the adoption of separated/protected bike lanes and cycle tracks, but it feels as though parking is being used as an excuse to not develop this safer option for those using active transportation. I don't believe we need to choose between infrastructure for cars and safe, effective infrastructure alternate modes of transportation.

Response from NIRCC: The increased interest in electric bikes is a relatively new phenomenon that planning, and local ordinances have not fully embraced. The emphasis has been on non-motorized bicycle planning and City Ordinance currently prohibits any motorized bicycle from using the trail or greenway system. City Ordinances appear to be mute regarding on-street bicycle infrastructure and E-Bikes. In most instances, rules become more stringent as one moves up from Class 1 to Class 2 or 3. Once city, town, and county ordinances address the differences between the E-Bike classes, there will be guidance to assist the planning process.

On-street parking is under the control of the roadway owner. State, city, town, and county governmental entities determine specific guidelines for parking, NIRCC does not address parking in the transportation plan.

4) Comment/Question: How does the NIRCC incorporate verbal public comment from public meetings and open houses? Are written comments the only feedback taken into consideration?

I would also suggest that the NIRCC consider alternate or varied Open House times. I spoke with several active transportation advocates that would have liked to attend but were unable to do so because of the timeframe.

Response from NIRCC: The Open House is intended to provide information, discussion, and answer questions about specific planning activities, programs, or proposed projects. For comments and feedback, participants are encouraged to fill out the comment form available at the Open House or go on-line and comment. NIRCC provides the same information on-line that is available at the Open House and is available for review and comment for at least 30 days.

5) Comment/Question: "Eliminate serious injuries and fatalities from transportation" (Vision Zero)

Response from NIRCC: NIRCC has a Toward Vision Zero Policy documented in the Comprehensive Safety Action Plan.

6) Comment/Question: "Evaluate signal timing..." Perhaps we can move towards sensor-based signals.

Response from NIRCC: Most intersections have vehicle detection utilizing induction loops, pucks or video. With detection, there is still a need to evaluate and optimize traffic signal phasing and timing.

7) Comment/Question: "Evaluate intersection radii..." Our corner radii are too large already and need tightened up to prevent dangerous turning at high speeds. If truck access is required, rumble strips and/or truck aprons can be employed.

Response from NIRCC: Evaluating intersection radii does not insinuate that all intersections need improvement, but where large trucks are prevalent and have difficulty making safe turns, jump curbs and damage infrastructure, improvements should be considered. The evaluation includes improving the safety of bicycle and pedestrian traffic and may result in restricting the radii.

8) Comment/Question: I strongly support guiding principle 2!

Response from NIRCC: Thank you.

9) Comment/Question: More types of bicycle infrastructure need to be considered outside of bike lanes, bike routes, and shared lanes. There needs to be protected infrastructure when car speeds are above 20mph, i.e., protected cycle tracks, and where the lanes are shared, driving needs to be discouraged and/or physically slowed down, i.e., bicycle boulevards/neighborhood greenways.

Response from NIRCC: Alternative bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in addition to bike lanes, bike routes, and shared lanes are being considered.

10) Comment/Question: Planning factor 5, guiding principle one, objective 1: it says "2020". Should that be something else?

Response from NIRCC: Yes, that should be 2045.

11) Comment/Question: I strongly support Objective 5!

Response from NIRCC: Thank you.

12) Comment/Question: Vehicle Ownership: if we're planning for more active transportation and transit use, shouldn't we expect a lower ratio than at present?

Response from NIRCC: While we are planning for more active transportation, we have not seen a significant reduction in vehicle ownership. We monitor these trends and update our planning assumptions every four to five years and update the transportation plan.

13) Comment/Question: Since there's an emphasis on active transportation and transit and since we need to reduce private vehicle VMTs per the Clean Air Act, should we not be planning to aggressively dedicate more right-of-way space to active transportation and transit rather than highway "improvements" to maintain level of service? I don't think we should take increased private vehicle use as a foregone conclusion. This plan should be how we prevent that from happening.

Response from NIRCC: While there is an emphasis on active transportation and transit, many businesses, residents, and visitors rely on passenger vehicles and trucks as a primary mode of transportation. The transportation plan is re-evaluated every four to five years, if vehicle miles of travel begin trending down, the plan will be adjusted accordingly.

14) Comment/Question: The map on page 115 highlights the need for our transportation system to prioritize non-car travel, including building out a safe, comfortable, and useful bike network and possibly implementing bus rapid transit.

Response from NIRCC: The map does validate the need for a multi-modal transportation system that includes bicycle, pedestrian, transit and highway travel.

15) Comment/Question: On page 122 it states that "Less congestion equates to reductions in noise, air pollution, travel times, energy consumption and accident rates." "Reduced congestion also improves accessibility, provides safer streets" Is there evidence for these claims? Fast free-flowing traffic is dangerous to people outside of cars.

Less congestion leads to more driving and therefore more of all of those things listed above. By "less congestion" does the plan mean less private motor vehicle use? Cars stuck in traffic are pretty quiet compared to cars and motorcycles racing by, and pretty safe as well. Electric and hybrid cars use very little energy at low speeds and in stop-and-go traffic. What kinds of accidents are caused by congestion? Are there serious injuries and fatalities? Could they be prevented by limiting the roadway to one lane in each direction to prevent jockeying back and forth?

Response from NIRCC: Less congestion does not equate to fast free-flow traffic conditions. It is understood that some congestion during certain time periods of the day is acceptable. The Congestion Management Process focusses on corridors that have multiple hours below a level of service "D." There is significant evidence that traffic congestion can create unsafe conditions.

16) Comment/Question: Regarding improving transit: has there been any discussions of local passenger rail service, under Citilink or a separate entity? At the very least, a rail shuttle between the airport and downtown could be rather useful.

Response from NIRCC: There has not been any proposal to provide local passenger rail service.

17) Comment/Question: The bike/ped plan needs to include protected on-street bike ways and, where right-of-way space is limited, bike-priority streets where vehicle traffic is slowed and discouraged through street design.

Response from NIRCC: Alternative bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in addition to bike lanes, bike routes, and shared lanes are being considered.

18) Comment/Question: Could W/E State Blvd get a road diet?

Response from NIRCC: A traffic diet is nor proposed for State Boulevard.

19) Comment/Question: We need to expand the list of possible bike facility types. The bike lanes and bike routes we have now are not acceptable for the streets they're on according to the FHWA and NACTO bikeway selection guides.

Response from NIRCC: Alternative bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in addition to bike lanes, bike routes, and shared lanes are being considered.

20) Comment/Question: Regarding new construction and widening projects: are we denying the existence of induced demand? By making driving faster and more convenient, we're encouraging more of it, not less. Active transportation and transit should be direct and convenient. Motor vehicle traffic should be made less direct and less convenient for short trips to discourage its overuse.

Response from NIRCC: There are many factors that govern travel demand including where people want to live, work, play, shop, and go to school. The new construction and widening projects are designed to improve safety, mobility, and reduce congestion.

21) Comment/Question: On page 133 "improve safety and traffic flow" These goals align on limited-access highways but are at odds on surface streets. Safety should be prioritized over traffic flow on our urban streets, especially downtown.

Response from NIRCC: Safety is prioritized over traffic flow, and improving traffic flow can result in improved safety. The transportation plan strives to improve the arterial roadway network to manage adequate traffic flow to discourage diversion onto local residential streets to avoid congested area. We believe this improves the overall safety of the transportation system.

22) Comment/Question: On page 134, "widen to four lanes": is there any reason these couldn't/shouldn't be three lanes? Multiple lanes in a direction encourage unsafe lane changes and jockeying for position, which can lead to crashes and other disruptions of traffic flow. They also make crossing the road more dangerous.

Response from NIRCC: The transportation plan includes a variety of roadway improvements including widening to four lanes, adding center turn lanes, reconstruction, and realignment. On some roadways, existing and/or future travel requires the capacity afforded by an additional travel lane in each direction.

23) Comment/Question: I know the current bus map is a hub and spoke system, but perhaps there could be new, shorter routes with better headways that can move people around the urban core without any transfers. For example, it would take almost as long to take the bus from Three Rivers Apartments to Electric Works as it would to walk.

Response from NIRCC: Citilink periodically evaluates different route structures to provide quality transit service.

24) Comment/Question: I support the new emphasis on Interstate mobility areas.

Response from NIRCC: Thank you.

25) Comment/Question: there should be more types of bike infrastructure listed, especially types that are safe and comfortable for people of all ages and abilities. Most of the bike infrastructure types listed are not appropriate for all ages and abilities. Sharrows are not appropriate infrastructure. Safe, inviting bike infrastructure is needed to convince more people to ride.

Response from NIRCC: Alternative bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in addition to bike lanes, bike routes, and shared lanes are being considered. Sharrows are not a

preferred bicycle facility type but serve a purpose when other infrastructure is not feasible.

26) Comment/Question: On page 177, signalization activities: can we move to smarter signaling by using more sensors? Also, we need leading pedestrian intervals or dedicated pedestrian phases.

Response from NIRCC: Most intersections have vehicle detection utilizing induction loops, pucks or video. With detection. Leading pedestrian intervals and dedicated pedestrian phases are considered where pedestrian traffic warrants.

27) Comment/Question: No severe injuries or fatalities from traffic crashes are acceptable. We need to adopt Vision Zero and a Safe System Approach. Every serious injury or fatality should cause that section of street to receive at least a temporary design change. All of our streets are too fast (by design), leading to preventable crashes.

Response from NIRCC: NIRCC has a Toward Vision Zero Policy documented in the Comprehensive Safety Action Plan and is following the Safe Systems Approach.

28) Comment/Question: Could we remove 930 and 27 from within the interstate loop? Is there any reason to encourage interstate travel along our city streets? There is danger posed by having so many lanes going in each direction, causing lane jockeying and recklessly high speeds at times of low traffic. And by being state roads, they are more difficult to improve for safety than other local streets. State Road 930 was originally a bypass, but surely it isn't considered one anymore.

Response from NIRCC: State Roads and US Routes serve to connect rural and urban areas, and urban areas with each other, and serve a role providing vehicular access and mobility. The Interstate system is designed to encourage interstate travel around the urban area and off the city streets. The same level of safety is applied to all state and local roadways. State Road 930 was originally built as a bypass (US 30), but the urban area expanded and no longer serves that purpose. However, it is still an important regional corridor that serves Purdue University Fort Wayne, Ivy Tech College, Allen County War Memorial Coliseum, regional shopping and employment centers.

29) Comment/Question: AARP Indiana submitted the following:
Core Message: AARP Indiana strives to empower Hoosiers to choose how they live as they age. Older residents of Indiana deserve transportation options that enhance their personal independence, allow them to age in place and help them engage in their community's civic, economic and social life. A person's destination shouldn't be based on their ability or desire to drive a car.

Transportation & Livable Communities

- Too many residents, in too many communities, don't have access to the transportation they need to do everyday tasks such as going to the grocery store or

the doctor. When tasks like those become too difficult it not only impacts a person's health, but it also impacts their overall quality of life.

- As Hoosiers grow older, one of the most critical factors in maintaining personal independence and fulfillment is their ability to move freely throughout their communities, accessing the goods, services, and social connections that they want and need.
- In doing so, our goal is to develop communities that allow individuals to age in place: to live in their homes and communities safely, independently, and comfortably, regardless of age, ability, or income-level.
- Hoosiers who are 50-plus want to easily get from place to place no matter which part of town they live, which makes access to reliable and convenient public transit critical to making communities more livable.
- At its most basic level, transit is about giving older adults options. It gives them an option to continue living independently in their own home even if they don't have a car. It gives them an option to continue their contribution to the economic strength of their community.
- Investment in public transportation has a tangible impact on people of all ages, but older residents in particular stand to benefit from better, more reliable transit options. Better bus service increases mobility and independence among older adults, improves safety and lessens social isolation.

30) Comment/Question: Fort Wayne Mayor's Age-Friendly Community Advisory Council submitted the following:

Priority Domain Goals: Transportation and Streets

1. Ensure the Mayor's Age Friendly Advisory Council's priorities are reflected in the All-In Allen Plan and other transportation focused community planning initiatives. Deadline: January 2024.
2. Improve bike and pedestrian infrastructure across the city, with initial focus on upgrading infrastructure on and around Clinton Street near the Turnstone campus. Deadline: Turnstone project – January 2025; other projects – ongoing/indefinitely.
3. Increase the capacity of transportation providers for individuals to access their community which includes medical, educational, therapeutic, recreational, shopping, governmental, and other services. Deadline: ongoing/indefinitely.

Priority Domain Goals: Housing

1. Strengthen 2-1-1, 3-1-1, CONNECT Allen County, and Aging and In-Home Services of Northeast Indiana as primary referral hubs for housing needs. Deadline: January 2023.
2. Increase volume of accessible and stable housing through participating in planning processes and educating stakeholders on housing options. Deadline: December 2026.
3. Establish an Affordable Housing Trust Fund within the City's Community Development Department fund affordable house, essential home repair needs, and accessibility modifications. Deadline: January 1, 2025.

Priority Domain Goals: Health and Wellness

1. Strengthen 2-1-1, 3-1-1, CONNECT Allen County, and Aging and In-Home Services of Northeast Indiana as primary referral hubs for housing needs. Deadline: January 1, 2023.
2. Decrease social isolation among older adults. Deadline: January 1, 2023.
3. Increase access to nutritious foods and healthy meal preparation. Deadline: January 1, 2025.

31) Comment/Question: The Greater Fort Wayne Team Community Action submitted the following:

Our team did a walk audit of this bridge (the West Jefferson Blvd pedestrian bridge) from the greenway exit ramp and determined that there is a strong need for guardrails. We anticipate an increase in active transportation traffic once our Community Action Project Route to Electric Works is published. The sidewalk is narrow over the bridge, and it seems to be the same width as the north sidewalk alongside Swinney Park heading west on W. Washington Blvd. Therefore, it may be feasible to include “Please walk your bike” warning signage, etc. as users approach the bridge. We are actively seeking input from the City of Fort Wayne offices for our Project Route to Electric works. The Fort Wayne Trails Executive Director is our project leader and is aware of the need for a guardrail. Further, would the W. Washington Blvd sidewalk project (PW0519S-000) impact this bridge?

Response from the City of Fort Wayne: We can explore the possibilities of “Walk your bike at the bridge crossings”. The W. Washington Blvd. sidewalk project will not affect the bridge but will allow passage to the bridge from the downtown during a flood situation when the park sections of trail is flooded.

**Comments from the NIRCC Transportation
Open House & Comment Period
April 5 – May 5, 2023**

1) Comment/Question: When adding or repainting bike lanes next to parking spots on the street, place the bike lane between the parking spot and the sidewalk to create a buffer between the bike lane and traffic.

Response from City of Fort Wayne: The City will investigate this option of bike lane location in future bike lane projects.

2) Comment/Question: The trails have been pivotal for me and my transportation needs. They have allowed me to sell my car and share my fiancée's car. My electric-assisted bike has become my primary form of transportation for work, groceries, and time with friends. I am extremely thankful for the trails we have now, and I encourage local and state government to invest in active transportation infrastructure so more people can save money, be healthy, and combat climate change.

Response from NIRCC: Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure are incorporated into virtually every construction project within the urban area, on both state and local roadways. In addition, many standalone trail projects are planned and will be implemented in our cities, towns, and county.

3) Comment/Question: Why are protected bike lanes not included in all reconstruction and realignment plans?

Response from NIRCC: Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure are incorporated into virtually every reconstruction and realignment project. Early in the design process, community and neighborhood input is sought to scope the project and incorporate desired features. Environmental impacts, limited right of way, and available financial resources do not generally allow for the accommodation of sidewalks, trails, and protected bike lanes. Within the project constraints, decisions must be made on the most desirable and practical infrastructure.

4) Comment/Question: NIRCC received three comments about the locally funded Coldwater Road project from Dupont Road to Union Chapel Road. Below are all three comments followed by a response from the City of Fort Wayne.

Comment #1: Under the locally funded highway projects, the Coldwater Road (Dupont to Union Chapel) is scheduled to be 3 lanes and starting construction in FY 2027.

A three-lane improvement is inadequate for the current traffic load. It will be overloaded before it is built. Yesterday, April 20, traffic was backed up south from the Union chapel intersection south to Badiac Road and west to Gongwer Drive. Daily the traffic is backed up to the east on Union Chapel. Widening the road from two lanes to three will increase speeds during nonpeak hours only making turning movements from side streets more dangerous. Obviously, the main bottleneck is the Coldwater-Union Chapel intersection. The proposed improvements to the intersection appear to fix maintenance issues but do not adequately address the traffic load. The project replaces the concrete but does not change the geometrics. If you are going to spend this much money, build for the future, do it correctly and build a traffic circle. Obviously, you have right-of-way problems with two businesses, a school and a cemetery. Do it right and do it once.

At the public meeting on this project, the public was told the construction would be in two phases. The first phase would start in FY 24. The Draft TIP has the project in FY 27. Why the delay?

Comment #2: There have been talks about widening that section for years now, and it is much needed considering the backups that occur during morning/end of day rush hour at Coldwater and Union Chapel. I heard in the local news some time back that there were plans to widen this section to 4 lanes beginning around 2025. I was surprised to see that the updated plan only calls for 3 lanes with center turn lane and the start of construction was pushed back. I feel that this would be a terrible mistake not fully taking into consideration the rapid growth that is occurring in the Northern areas of Fort Wayne/Hunertown/Allen County. It's not only just the extra traffic from new housing/apartments, which is currently being built up all the way to Shoaff Road, but also future businesses along the corridor, not to mention the continued growth of the Northwest Allen County School District trying to address capacity issues and the likely building of a 3rd middle school.

I did notice that there were new projects listed and this, among others, were projects that were not federally funded. I know that makes it difficult when trying to allocate the resources required to do everything that is needed, but Coldwater Road will definitely play a major role for a large chunk of the future growth that is occurring.

With all things considered, if the average daily traffic count is currently a toss-up as to whether 4 lanes are warranted, I would say it definitely will be in as short a span as the time construction would actually begin. By then, the widening of Union Chapel Road will have to be taken into consideration as these areas go hand-in-hand with access to I69. This brings me to one other question: What is the timeline looking like in terms of a potential interchange at I-69 & Hursh Road?

Comment #3: Previously this project was listed as a 4-lane project, now it is a three lane? It's already bad, this idea will make it even harder to get around. Please reconsider making this a 4-lane project.

Response from City of Fort Wayne: The project is being done to address both traffic and safety concerns plus making this route a multi-modal area. The intersections will be addressed to pass through the 20,000 plus vehicles a day. A three-lane roadway is sufficient to carry over 20,000 vehicles a day which is more than the projected traffic for this roadway. A multi-lane roundabout at intersections in these areas is not a proper solution due to the variance in traffic flow and concerns from the public on navigating them. The project is going to take longer to get to construction because of the need to buy more ROW than initially anticipated and the need for many utilities to relocate along the project route. We hope to start construction sooner if those items can be completed faster than has been done on past projects.

5) Comment/Question: I would like to see a combined active transportation plan document in the future. As a user of active transportation as a primary mode of transportation to move around the city, it is difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of plans when having to look at a separate sidewalk, bike, and trail plan. These should not be designed in a vacuum, as often, safe and effective transportation routes may include a variety of options from sidewalk to trails, which are often disconnected due to the current planning process. How a person travels and where people are traveling should be considered (school, grocery store, etc.) when planning these transportation options, especially considering that we need to reduce emissions to meet the challenges of a change climate.

Response from NIRCC: The City of Fort Wayne and NIRCC are collaborating on an active transportation plan. The questions regarding active transportation at the open house are the initial phase of getting local preferences from the public. A survey will be launched sometime in May asking similar questions. While the sidewalk, bike, and trail plans are displayed on separate maps, these plans are not produced in a vacuum, and a variety of all active transportation infrastructure options are considered. Schools, parks, grocery stores, other retail centers, employment locations, residential areas, etc. are all taken into consideration when considering the appropriate types of infrastructure to provide safe and effective connections. When developing the plans, we engage local citizens and groups to participate in the planning process to help design the plans, provide input, and comment. The public will be engaged in the active transportation plan as it develops.

6) Comment/Question: The Time Corners area needs to be addressed. Accidents occur frequently. I was told the city is unable to buy the gas station due to cost. This is a major intersection due to the emergency vehicles located on Getz Road along with the city moving certain departments to the old Auto Mall.

Response from City of Fort Wayne: The safety of this intersection was greatly improved with the project completed around 2009. The city continues to monitor this area daily. We will continue to look for improvements to increase the safety of this area.

7) Comment/Question: When will there be sidewalks and/or trails along Illinois Road between Magnavox Way & Jefferson Boulevard? They are needed along this corridor.

Response from City of Fort Wayne: The project has been designed (sidewalk on north side and trail on south side). We've bid this project out three times, but the bids have come back extremely high. So, we've had to reject bids all three times. We do hope to build the trail on the south side someday, but we'll have to secure additional funding as we anticipate the trail to be \$5 million to construct.

8) Comment/Question: When will there be sidewalks and/or trails along Covington Road between Hadley Road & Getz Road? They are needed along this corridor.

Response from City of Fort Wayne: A trail has been designed for the north side. We are halfway finished with right of way acquisition. We'll bid the project soon with construction this summer through the summer of 2024.

9) Comment/Question: Are there any projects along the following corridors, Rudisill Boulevard; Fairfield Avenue; Harrison Street; or Broadway? Is the Bluffton Road Bridge in the 2024-2028 Transportation Improvement Program?

Response from NIRCC: There are not any projects on Rudisill Boulevard, Fairfield Avenue, or Harrison Street in the FY2024-28 Transportation Improvement Program. The Bluffton Road Bridge and an intersection improvement at Broadway and Taylor are included.

The following comments and questions are referring to the Draft 2024-2028 Transportation Improvement Program.

10) Comment/Question: Inflation is 3-5%. Is this sufficient?

Response from NIRCC: Inflation and supply issues have increased project development and construction costs. Recently these costs have increased significantly, and all project cost estimates have been adjusted to reflect this increase. As supplies of materials increase and stabilize, project development and construction costs are anticipated to stabilize and 3-5% is sufficient.

11) Comment/Question: "Travel time reliability" is used on p 33. How is this calculated?

Response from NIRCC: The travel time reliability is calculated by dividing the 95th percentile time by the normal time (50th percentile) for each interstate segment, for five separate time periods of the day. The travel time index is generated by multiplying each Interstate segment's largest ratio by its length, then dividing the sum of all length-weighted segments by the total length of Interstate.

12) Comment/Question: Environmental Goals: to enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment. Climate change?

Response from NIRCC: Improving the performance of the transportation system includes strategies to reduce vehicle emissions, that includes greenhouse gases. Improving the performance of the transportation system will help slow climate change.

13) Comment/Question: What do the percentages mean in Tables 4 and 5 on pp 39-40? Calculation not explained in text.

Response from NIRCC: Level of Travel Time Reliability (LOTTR) is defined as the ratio of the longer travel times (80th percentile) to a “normal” travel time (50th percentile), using data from FHWA’s National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS) or equivalent. Data are collected in 15-minute segments during all time periods between 6 a.m. and 8 p.m. local time. The measures are the percentage of person-miles traveled on the relevant portion of the NHS that are reliable. Person-miles takes into account the users of the NHS. Data to reflect the users can include bus, auto, and truck occupancy levels.

14) Comment/Question: What is the definition of the “truck reliability Index” in Table 5, p 40. Should these be percents?

Response from NIRCC: Measurement of travel time reliability on the Interstate System (Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index). Freight movement will be assessed by the TTTR Index. Reporting is divided into five periods: morning peak (6-10 a.m.), midday (10 a.m.-4 p.m.) and afternoon peak (4-8 p.m.) Mondays through Fridays; weekends (6 a.m.-8 p.m.); and overnights for all days (8 p.m.-6 a.m.). The TTTR ratio will be generated by dividing the 95th percentile time by the normal time (50th percentile) for each segment. The TTTR Index will be generated by multiplying each segment’s largest ratio of the five periods by its length, then dividing the sum of all length-weighted segments by the total length of Interstate.

15) Comment/Question: How were the mobile source emission targets chosen? Relationship to EPA rules?

Response from NIRCC: The mobile source emission targets are an assessment of the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program. The CMAQ program’s purpose is to fund transportation projects or programs that contribute to the attainment or maintenance of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Congress through MAP21 required FHWA to establish performance measures for the on road mobile source emissions. Total emissions reduction is calculated by summing 2- and 4-year totals of emissions reductions of applicable criteria pollutant and precursor, in kilograms per day, for all projects funded with CMAQ funds.

16) Comment/Question: Do the entries in Table 1, p 65 and Table 2, p 66 include funds from the 2021 Federal Infrastructure law?

Response from NIRCC: The federal funds in Tables 1 and 2 are funds provided through the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) of 2021, also referred to as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Legislation (BIL).

17) Comment/Question: Do the entries in Table 3, p 67 and Table 4, p67 include funds from the 2021 Federal Infrastructure law?

Response from NIRCC: The funds in Tables 3 and 4 are locally held funds. State Fuel taxes provide the revenue for Motor Vehicle Highway (MVH) and Local Roads and Streets (LR&S) funds. Wheel taxes and County Economic Development Income Taxes (CEDIT) are additional local revenue sources. These funds do not come from the Federal Infrastructure Law but are used to match the federal funds and cover transportation operations and maintenance costs.

18) Comment/Question: The report states: “The growth in future Citilink expenses is calculated using an expected increase of 4 percent per year for most categories.” (p 71). What percent is used to estimate revenues in Table 2, p 72?

Response from NIRCC: The revenues in table 2, p72 were increased by two percent per year.

19) Comment/Question: Appendix C: What is the significance of the size of the dot used in the tables?

Response from NIRCC: The dots in reference are part of the Performance Measures Assessment Report (PMAR). This is a comprehensive list of the projects in the TIP that has been developed to assess specific performance measures each project addresses. The larger dot represents the primary performance measure the project addresses and the smaller dot represents the secondary performance measure that the project addresses.

NIRCC Transportation Comments FY2022 – FY2023

1) Comment/Question: The stop sign at Avondale Drive and Pettit Avenue has been run over multiple times (probably 10 times over the years) and the problem stems from a traffic backup at Pettit Avenue going west bound because the stoplight at Pettit Avenue and Lafayette Street only stays green for about 10 seconds. This isn't an issue most of the day, but at 5 PM, there is always a long backup and it makes it really hard for people who are going south on Avondale Drive to turn left (east) onto Pettit Avenue. Cars will sit for a while and get impatient and then finally go when they think they can but a vehicle heading east on Pettit Avenue will hit them. It's kind of hard to explain, but it's a problem that really needs to be address. I've had employees' cars get hit, and it's just a matter of time before a pedestrian gets run over. I've called 311 about it but they just say the traffic light is working like it's supposed to. We put up a guard rail last year to help protect our building at 502 E Pettit Avenue and it's been hit three times already.

Response from NIRCC: NIRCC, in conjunction with the City of Fort Wayne and INDOT will evaluate the Lafayette Street/US 27 and Pettit Avenue intersection to assess the level of service and determine if signal timings or phases can be modified. I had staff pull the crash data for Avondale Drive and Pettit Avenue and that will be incorporated into the evaluation. We will need to collect some data from the Lafayette Street/US 27 and Pettit Avenue intersection, analyze and discuss. The evaluation will take several months to complete.

2) Comment/Question: I would like to inquire about changing the direction of a one-way street. This would ultimately involve redoing the traffic light at Broadway and Bluffton Road, so it's kind of a longterm project but would really help reduce speeding cars in the neighborhood.

Oakdale Drive is currently a one-way to the east just after the Bluffton Road/Broadway intersection, but some residents in the neighborhood have been complaining because motorist tend to speed on the road (or going the speed limit which is pretty fast for that street and is often perceived as speeding) as they are entering the neighborhood. I was thinking if we could change the one-way on Oakdale Drive (between Broadway and Beaver Avenue) to be west bound, that would solve the speeding issue, though it would also require redoing the stoplights at the intersection of Broadway and Bluffton Road. I was just kicking this idea around and wanted to know if it would be feasible. I'm on the board of the Oakdale Neighborhood Association, so I hear the complaints about things like this and there have been many about speeding on that section of Oakdale Drive.

The traffic accidents at Avondale and Pettit are more of a pressing concern in my mind. We put up a guard rail last year to help protect our building at 502 E Pettit and it's been hit three time already.

Response from NIRCC: A discussion was held on the potential for changing Oakdale Drive to a one-way west bound with Fort Wayne Traffic Engineering. It was determined that the alignment of Oakdale Drive with Bluffton Road is not conducive for allowing west bound Oakdale traffic to navigate through the intersection. We suggest the Neighborhood Association work with Fort Wayne Traffic Engineering to investigate potential traffic calming measures to slow vehicle speeds. Please reach out to Kyle Winling, Fort Wayne Traffic Engineer if the Association would like to discuss traffic calming options.

3) Comment/Question: I use the trails both walking and biking with dogs. This summer my dog and I were biking east on Aboite Center Road and was nearly ran over by a guy trying to turn right on red at 24 and Aboite Center Road. Somebody ahead of us triggered the pedestrian signal and we got there when the signal showed a flashing red hand and had counted from 28 to 20. I was shook up and talked to people, that don't use the trails, who said they wouldn't have known who had the right of way cause "why was it a red hand if you had the right of way?". So my suggestion is, could the flashing countdown be with the white walk symbol or maybe a yellow hand so it's easier for non-crosswalk users to understand?

Response from NIRCC: I don't think you are the only one who may not know what the appropriate action is in a situation like this. Regardless of what the rules are though, as a pedestrian or bicyclist, the best practice is always to assume a person in a vehicle does not see you and make sure you make eye contact with that individual before assuming it is safe to cross. Unfortunately, even if the pedestrian is doing the right thing, a pedestrian or bicyclist will always be the most vulnerable in a collision with a motor vehicle.

From the situation you described, it sounds like the proper action would be for a pedestrian or bicyclist, who has not initiated a crossing during the walk sign indication, should wait until the next signal phase when a walk sign indication is displayed. The flashing upraised hand signal indicating "Don't Walk" is meant to warn pedestrians, who are already crossing, that the phase will be ending soon and they should continue to proceed to the far side of the intersection.

Signals like these are used and installed in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways, or MUTCD, which defines the standards used by road managers nationwide to install and maintain traffic control devices on all public streets, highways, bikeways, and private roads open to public travel. The MUTCD is published by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). This manual also describes what the different signal indications mean. These standards are intended to be used throughout the nation so that there is a standard set of rules and signals that people can understand and use wherever they travel.

According to the MUTCD, here are the signal indications and what they actually mean:

- When there is a steady, "Walking Person" (symbolizing "Walk"), the pedestrian facing this signal is permitted to start crossing the roadway in the direction of the signal indication. If there are already vehicles still within the intersection completing the previous phase (like vehicles waiting to turn) the pedestrian must yield to these vehicles before proceeding when the Walk signal is first shown.
- When there is a flashing "Upraised Hand" (symbolizing "Don't Walk") pedestrians are not supposed to start to cross the roadway in the direction of the signal indication, but if any pedestrian has already started to cross on the steady "Walking Person" symbol, they shall proceed to the far side of the traveled way of the street.

- When there is a steady “Upraised Hand” (symbolizing “Don’t Walk”) pedestrians are not supposed to enter the roadway in the direction of the signal indication.

4) Comment/Question: There are only a few segments of sidewalk on this section of road. I see children and people with strollers trying to walk along Lower Huntington Road. We need sidewalks along this roadway.

Response from NIRCC: The City of Fort Wayne has two active projects that will construct sidewalks along this section of Lower Huntington Road

5) Comment/Question: There is a considerable amount of traffic on Ardmore Road between Lower Huntington Road and Covington Road, when will it be improved?

Response from NIRCC: The improvement project for Ardmore Road between Lower Huntington Road and Covington Road is in the Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program. The project will be included in the FY2024-28 Transportation Improvement Program and design work will be initiated in 2024 or 2025.

6) Comment/Question: NIRCC received two comments about proposed improvements to US 30. Below are the two comments followed by a response from NIRCC.

Comment #1: This comment is about closing the crossing at US 30 and Kroemer Road. For those of us on the southwest side of Fort Wayne who travel on US 30 westbound to Columbia City and Warsaw regularly, the objective of getting on US 30 westbound is to AVOID the entrance to US 30 from the Coliseum Blvd/US 30 interchange area with I-69 if at all possible. The preferred route is Hillegas Road north to Leesburg Road, westbound, then north on Kroemer Road (roundabout there would be great) to the intersection at US 30. There is a traffic light there which makes turning onto westbound US 30 much safer. So we avoid turning left onto US 30 from ANY of the intersections west of Kroemer Road, as there are NO stoplights there. Eliminating left turns onto US 30 from northbound Kromer Road will make getting onto westbound US 30 that much MORE dangerous.

The alternative is taking Bass Road (currently closed for another project!) west all the way to County Line Road, then north to US 30, where there is a traffic signal. Not an attractive option.

Or take Hillegas Road north all the way to Washington Center Road, west on Washington Center Road to Goshen Rd/US 33, then south to the US 30 entrance ramp, which adds a couple miles and MORE traffic to the trip.

Comment #2: From the very beginning of the public disclosure of this project INDOT and the US 30 coalition have proceeded with developing a plan that ignores or gives little weight to the enormous negative economic and safety impact concerns that have been raised. Instead their

focus appears to be on satisfying a commitment to AMAZON to provide a new interchange at Flaugh Road without regard to the complete disruption of existing traffic patterns and the future safety and access issue that will be created. In public comment and presentation events there have been many false and misleading statements and information given to the general public and effected parties. Effected parties and public officials have been pressured and in some cases bullied for not fully endorsing INDOTS preconceived ideas and plans. The resulting rerouting of this tremendous vehicular and tractor trailer traffic and the effects it will have on the existing infrastructure and safety issues, including redirecting past an existing elementary school, have not even been fully studied or resolved. As of this morning Commissioner Peters informed me that to his knowledge nothing has been agreed to as to who would be responsible for these changes or who would pay for them. INDOT has also failed to respond to the issues of improving the current 4-way light at Kroemer Road to improve safety and more importantly have not studied the effects of safety by having these right in right out interchanges in such close proximity to the proposed Flaugh Road interchange and the 33 interchange. Common sense tells you that the tremendous amount of lane changes necessitated by this amount of traffic in a short space will probably exceed any potential safety improvements over the existing 4 way at Kroemer Road. In summary I believe that INDOT and the US 30 Coalition have engaged in a scorched earth policy of getting this portion of the project pulled out of the balance of the corridor overall project in order to circumvent a complete and independent review of the resulting effects. I truly believe that the current proposal will result in a traffic flow that will be detrimental to existing businesses and residents while creating a less safe traffic pattern. It is not necessary to close or replace the existing 4 way light at Kroemer Road to achieve a more efficient safer US 30 corridor from Valparaiso to I-69. Not one of the projected extra vehicles in the coming years would decline to use this corridor for an average 25 second additional travel time. Please make sure to include these comments in the public comment section for this project.

Response from NIRCC: Comment on the proposed improvements to US 30. We understand that eliminating left-turns at US 30 and Kroemer Road will change how motorists access US 30. Several options that will be afforded by additional projects on US 30 include two new interchanges, one at US 30 and Flaugh Road, and the other at US 30 and Leesburg/Felger Roads. The two interchanges will provide safe access from the local road network to the US 30 corridor.

7) Comment/Question: We live on Kroemer Road, we built our home here in 1972. When we moved here, there was no former North American complex, no Sweetwater, no 4-way stop, no traffic light at US 30, and my road was gravel. There have been changes in the 50 years we have lived here, but it is home. We know that this is something that happens as an area changes, a city expands, and traffic increases.

But on December 16th just a day after your last meeting at Sweetwater, I was coming home from work and pulled in my drive to see a gentleman digging holes in the middle of my front yard. As I got out of my car, he saw me and came over to tell me what he was doing and that he had talked to my husband. He was very polite and explained that he was digging holes looking for artifacts. My front yard is 300 feet from the crossroad of Kroemer Road and California Road.

We have attended every meeting that has been at Sweetwater involving the US 30 improvements. We figured that possibly the four-way stop would need some changes. So the proposed roundabout that we saw at the last meeting did not surprise us because it seems like they are putting them everywhere. I do not understand why my front yard 300 feet from the intersection would be involved in the roundabout.

I hope that as you decide what to do for improvements, that you think about the people that live close by and keep them in consideration of your plans.

Response from NIRCC: Thank you for your email and thank you for participating in the public meetings. When a project is being prepared, an environmental assessment is required including an archeological survey. An Area of Potential Effect is established that goes beyond the anticipated construction limits. This area is thoroughly assessed for any potential environmental or cultural impacts that may be impacted by the project. We attempt to minimize impacts to the homes and lives of people living nearby as we improve the safety and mobility of our roadway network.

8) Comment/Question: Comment: The east bound to north bound left-turn arrow at Paulding Road and Lafayette Street/US 27 does not provide enough time for the amount of left-turning traffic. Only about three cars can make it through. Can the left-turn arrow be given more time?

Response from NIRCC: NIRCC will evaluate the intersection and in conjunction with the Indiana Department of Transportation and City of Fort Wayne discuss the ability to adjust the timing.

9) Comment/Question: There are a considerable number of west bound vehicles that want to turn right and go north on Bluffton Road from Lower Huntington Road, but there is not a separate right-turn lane. Adding a right-turn lane would improve traffic flow through the intersection.

Response from NIRCC: NIRCC will evaluate the intersection and in conjunction with the City of Fort Wayne discuss the feasibility of constructing a right turn lane.

10) Comment/Question: Transit service needs to be extended later at night so second shift employees can use transit to get home.

Response from NIRCC: This is a common request. Currently Citilink does not have the funding available to provide additional hours of service.

11) Comment/Question: Wallen Road and Clinton Street Intersection needs to be improved and signalized, it is not safe and gets congested. When will this intersection be improved?

Response from NIRCC: NIRCC in conjunction with the City of Fort Wayne has programmed an improvement project for Clinton Street that includes improving the Wallen Road intersection. The project is in the development and design stage and the first phase is scheduled to begin construction in the fall of 2028.

12) Comment/Question: Will Coldwater Road be widened to four lanes between Dupont Road and Union Chapel Road?

Response from NIRCC: This section of Coldwater Road is currently being designed by the City of Fort Wayne as a three-lane road widening project.

13) Comment/Question: Can transit service be provided to the Hallmark Inn, 3730 E Washington Boulevard? People living at this location must walk along/through the interchange area to New Haven Avenue to catch a bus.

Response from NIRCC: The City of Fort Wayne is constructing a sidewalk to provide pedestrian infrastructure connecting the Hallmark Inn to New Haven Avenue.

14) Comment/Question: The intersection of Wayne Trace and Paulding Road does not function well as an all-way stop, motorists don't understand the how to appropriately wait their turn to proceed through the intersection. Can a traffic signal be installed at this intersection?

Response from NIRCC: NIRCC will evaluate the intersection for signal warrants and discuss the feasibility of an improvement with the City of Fort Wayne and Allen County.

15) Comment/Question: The signal at the Anthony Boulevard and Rudisill Boulevard intersection does not function well during the afternoon peak causing traffic to back-up.

Response from NIRCC: NIRCC will evaluate the intersection and in conjunction with the City of Fort Wayne discuss the feasibility of adjusting the signal timing.