



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.3 Social Impacts..... 2

    3.3.1 Introduction and Background ..... 2

    3.3.2 Methodology..... 2

    3.3.3 Analysis ..... 3

        3.3.3.1 Neighborhood and Community Cohesion..... 3

        3.3.3.2 Religious and Social Communities ..... 3

    3.3.4 Travel Patterns and Accessibility ..... 4

    3.3.5 Organizations and Institutions ..... 5

        3.3.5.1 Educational Institutions ..... 5

        3.3.5.2 Recreational Facilities ..... 5

        3.3.5.3 Religious Institutions..... 6

        3.3.5.4 Public Safety Facilities ..... 7

        3.3.5.5 Major Health Care Facilities ..... 8

        3.3.5.6 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities..... 8

    3.3.6 Mitigation..... 9

    3.3.7 Summary..... 9



## 3.3 SOCIAL IMPACTS

### 3.3.1 Introduction and Background

The construction of the Mid-States Corridor would have both negative and positive social impacts to the communities within the Study Area. Sections 1 and 2 of each alternative will have similar impacts to communities and community resources and facilities.

Each alternative is expected to impact nearby communities. Alternatives will avoid direct impacts to larger communities such as Huntingburg, Jasper, Washington, Loogootee, Bedford, French Lick, West Baden and Mitchell. Social impacts to these communities will include changes in access and altered travel patterns. These impacts will also affect smaller communities which have strong ties to larger communities for services and community resources. Given the general rural nature of the Study Area, maintaining the social fabric and connection between communities is an important consideration.

The following sections address communities and neighborhoods potentially impacted by each alternative, as well as impacts to community resources. Community resources include educational, public safety, medical, recreational, religious, bicycle and mobility facilities. Every alternative will cause changes for local travel routes and impact response times for emergency medical services. For rural communities that are served only by two-lane state highways, a new facility may improve emergency medical response times.

Qualitative impacts to organizations and facilities are expected to be minimal. Coordination with **Chapter 3.5 – Relocation** is discussed below for direct impacts on organizations and facilities.

**Appendix DD** provides a more detailed analysis, including additional descriptions, graphics and tables.

### 3.3.2 Methodology

Social impacts in this section are assessed primarily in a qualitative manner. This analysis considered potential impacts on access, travel patterns and cohesion. Numerical estimates of impacts to homes, businesses and institutions is provided in **Section 3.5 – Relocations**. At a Tier 1 level of analysis, such impacts for a given alternative do not differ meaningfully for different facility types of a given alternative. Accordingly, this analysis does not attempt to distinguish impacts for different facility types of a given alternative. Qualitative impacts were calculated using the project's Geographic Information System (GIS). See **Section 3.1 – Overview and Methodology** for details about the project's GIS.

To assess impacts to neighborhood and community cohesion, the 2,000-foot-wide corridor centered on each alternative's centerline was used. A two-mile buffer from the corridor was used to identify cities, towns and communities with potential social impacts. Impacts to organizations and facilities were assessed using the 2,000-foot-wide corridor with a one-mile buffer from the corridor.

Impacts on access to these facilities from the surrounding communities were documented and analyzed in detail in **Appendix DD – Social Impacts Appendix**. The analysis in **Section 3.3.3** summarized this detailed analysis. The operation of these facilities, including school bus routes and emergency medical service access, were also considered in assessing each alternative in relation to communities, organizations and facilities. Bicycle and pedestrian mobility facilities were assessed using the same methodology. Data from county and city websites also were reviewed. In addition, impacts to religious and social communities within the Study Area were assessed using information gathered from public meetings, regional stakeholders and community meetings between project team management and group leaders.



## 3.3.3 Analysis

### 3.3.3.1 Neighborhood and Community Cohesion

A new roadway facility will have both negative and positive impacts to the nearby communities. A new highway facility would result in altered travel patterns, increase travel times in some instances and improve travel times in others. The new facility will restrict access between some communities. Changes to accessibility across the new facility may result in a number of social impacts by disrupting community and neighborhood cohesion (see **Table 2-1** and **Figure 2-1** in **Appendix DD**).

Of the alternatives being considered, Alternative C impacts the fewest communities, at five cities and five rural communities. Alternative P impacts the most communities, at nine cities and nine rural communities. Section 2 of Alternative C heads north from I-64 and Dale around the eastside of Huntingburg and Jasper and would divide the Maltersville and Jasper communities (**Figure 2-2** in **Appendix DD**). There are potential community impacts if Maltersville relies on Jasper for services, but these would be limited by perpetuating SR 162, the primary existing connection between the communities. Section 2 of Alternative C ends on the north side of Jasper. Section 3 of Alternative C begins and briefly intersects US 231 near Haysville. As it continues north, it passes near Alfordsville. Before connecting to I-69 at Washington, Alternative C passes the communities of Montgomery and Black Oak near US 50 (**Figure 2-3** in **Appendix DD**). Access between Washington and Montgomery could be impacted by the corridor. Section 2 of Alternative P is identical to Section 2 of Alternative C. Section 3 of Alternative P will either bypass Loogootee to the east or west near US 50, but both will pass the same communities along the existing US 231 (**Figure 2-3** in **Appendix DD**). The eastern bypass would bisect a small population at Mount Pleasant near Loogootee. North of Loogootee, the alternative would pass a cluster of communities including Bramble, Ranglesville, Burns City, Odon and Farlen. These communities are currently served by US 231 as well as multiple local county roads. Alternative P will not cause direct impacts to any of these communities, but access to and between these communities could potentially be impacted. Access decisions would be evaluated and finalized in Tier 2 to minimize negative access effects to the communities. Alternative P terminates at I-69 near Crane and Scotland.

Local improvements associated with each alternative are generally expected to have minimal neighborhood and community cohesion impacts as most occur among extremely scattered rural residences and are associated with existing highways.

The number of communities within the two-mile bands increases as the length of the corridor increases. The number of communities or alternatives identified does not reflect an inherent greater degree of impact. All of the corridors either bypass or traverse the outskirts of the major cities and towns of Huntingburg, Jasper, Washington, Loogootee, French Lick, Mitchell and Bedford. This does not indicate that there will be no cohesion impacts to these communities; however, the greater impact is anticipated on the small communities and neighborhoods surrounding these cities and towns. The preferred alternative, Alternative P, will pass within two miles of eight to nine cities and nine communities.

### 3.3.3.2 Religious and Social Communities

Project team members were able to meet with two Amish communities, one in Daviess/Martin counties and one in Orange/Lawrence counties and obtain additional information on the location of Amish communities in the Study Area. These two concentrations of Amish communities have the potential to be impacted by this project if Alternatives O or P are selected.

#### Alternative O

Amish-owned parcels were located generally west of Mitchell and Orleans and generally south of SR 60 to Orangeville in Orange and Lawrence counties (**Figure 2-5** in **Appendix DD**). Amish farms are crossed by Alternative O,



and Amish properties not directly within the alignment would be split from other Amish properties by the corridor, potentially causing both quantitative impacts to individual properties and qualitative community cohesion impacts. Additional Amish residences and properties were identified ranging from Orangeville in the south to SR 60 in the north and just west of CR 500 W to just east of SR 37. Given the location and extent of the Amish community in northern Orange County and Southern Lawrence County in relation to Alternative O, relocation impacts and cohesion impacts are expected. Impacts to relocation, access, safety and travel patterns would depend on facility type and final alignment. Additional coordination with the community would be warranted if Alternative O is selected.

### Alternative P

Daviess County is the third largest Amish populated county in Indiana and the largest Amish populated county in the Study Area. Most families within their community live between I-69 to the west, US 50 to the south, US 231 to the east, and SR 58 to the north (**Figure 2-6 in Appendix D** Error! Reference source not found.). North of Loogootee, Alternative P is located west of US 231 and travels north to I-69. As mentioned above, Amish communities reside to the west of US 231. Based upon this information, there are potential quantitative and qualitative impacts if Alternative P is selected. The level of impacts, which may include relocations, changes to access, safety and travel patterns, would depend on facility type and final alignment. As the preferred alternative, additional coordination with the community is warranted for Alternative P.

Additionally, Alternative B and C will traverse the southern portion of Daviess County. However, as mentioned above, the southern boundary of the Amish community is generally US 50. It is unlikely that either of these alternatives will impact the Daviess County Amish population, but future coordination may be warranted in Tier 2 studies if either of these alternatives are selected. At this time, there are no other known locations of Amish communities within the Study Area.

## 3.3.4 Travel Patterns and Accessibility

The Study Area's major cities and towns should be minimally impacted by any of the alternatives in terms of changes to access to community resources and services. Community resources such as grocery stores, pharmacies, shopping centers, etc., generally are located within the urban area or commercial and downtown core of communities. All alternatives avoid the urban areas for the major towns and cities. Travel patterns within these towns and cities should be minimally impacted.

However, populations outside these towns and cities may have altered access to larger services and facilities located in nearby towns. There may be changes in accessibility and impacts to local and county roads currently used. Local residents would need to use the interchange or intersections created by the new facility which may lead to either increased or decreased travel times depending on facility and final alignment. Specific changes will be assessed as part of the Tier 2 NEPA studies.

The Study Area's public transportation systems are limited; therefore, impacts are expected to be minimal. School districts and educational facilities potentially impacted are discussed in **Section 3.3.7.1** below and **Section 4.1 of Appendix DD**. School bus routes may be impacted by any of the alternatives.

Specific relocation and qualitative cohesion impacts to organizations and facilities are discussed in the following sections. Direct impacts to public facilities are expected to be minimal. Cohesion impacts and access between communities will depend on alternative and facility type. Impacts caused by changes in local roadway networks and access across a new facility may be minimized and designed to provide adequate accessibility through continued coordination with local officials and stakeholders.



## **3.3.5 Organizations and Institutions**

### **3.3.5.1 Educational Institutions**

All of the alternatives have the potential to impact the school corporations they traverse (See **Table 4-1** in **Appendix DD**). The magnitude of impacts will depend on the facility type as well as access locations throughout the school corporations. The impacts may include altered bus routes that may result in longer travel times for some but shorter for others. There does not appear to be a greater impact to school corporations from one alternative to another.

#### **Alternative B**

The corridor has the potential to impact access to Dr. Ted's Musical Marvels Museum north of I-64 near the US 231 interchange. The facility is located along US 231, which already is a four-lane highway; any additional impacts are anticipated to be minimal.

#### **Alternative C**

**Section 2 (Same for M, O and P):** The corridor will potentially impact Dr. Ted's Musical Marvels Museum north of I-64, noted previously.

**Section 3:** The corridor will go between the Pleasantview Christian Day School and Montgomery, which could impede access between the two. The Legacy Learning Center is near the 2,000-foot corridor on US 50. There could be both direct relocation and qualitative impacts possible depending on facility type as well as final alignment and access decisions.

#### **Alternative M**

**Section 2:** See Alternative C.

**Section 3:** The Community Learning Center of Martin County and North Lawrence Career Center are located within the proposed corridor. Direct relocation impacts, as well as impacts to access and bus routes, are possible for these institutions depending on facility type and final alignment.

#### **Alternative O**

**Section 2:** See Alternative C.

**Section 3:** There are two facilities at the termination of the corridor, Hatfield Elementary School and Mitchell Head Start. No direct impacts are anticipated for Hatfield Elementary School based on its location relative to the corridor. However, potential relocation and access impacts are possible for the Mitchell Head Start depending on facility type.

#### **Alternative P**

**Section 2:** See Alternative C.

**Section 3:** The western bypass of Alternative P at Loogootee would traverse the Barr-Reeve Community School Corporation. The eastern bypass would traverse the Loogootee Community School Corporation. North of Loogootee, Alternative P would traverse the Loogootee Community School Corporation and North Daviess Community School Corporation. The eastern bypass would also divide the Community Learning Center of Martin County from Loogootee, causing cohesion impacts.

### **3.3.5.2 Recreational Facilities**

Recreational areas evaluated for this study include trails, public and private outdoor recreational facilities, National Natural Landmarks, publicly and privately owned managed lands and the Hoosier National Forest management area



(See **Table 4-2** in **Appendix DD**). Many of the recreational facilities are located on the outskirts of larger communities. Therefore, many of the qualitative impacts mentioned are associated with potentially restricted access to these facilities from the surrounding communities. Local improvements are not anticipated to impact any recreational facilities.

### Alternative B

The corridor could cause access impacts to Maple Grove Camp, Stewart Public Access site and the Glendale Fish and Wildlife Area.

### Alternative C

**Section 2 (Same for Alternative M, O and P):** The corridor could cause access impacts to Ireland Park and Park Trail, Ireland Community Center, Haysville Park, Buffalo Pond Nature Preserve and Sultan's Run Golf Course. Sultan's Run Golf Course may also receive direct impacts depending on facility type and final alignment. Local improvements could temporarily impede access to Jasper Parklands and State Police Park during the construction phase.

**Section 3:** The corridor could impact access to Glendale Fish and Wildlife Area and Country Oaks Golf Club.

### Alternative M

**Section 2:** See Alternative C.

**Section 3:** Alternative M has potential direct and access impacts to the planned section of the Milwaukee Rail Trail, Martin County 4-H Fairgrounds and portions of Martin State Forest. Additional coordination with the Martin State Forest would be required if Alternative M is the selected preferred alternative.

### Alternative O

**Section 2:** See Alternative C.

Direct and relocation impacts are also possible for the Fraternal Order of Police Jasper Wood Lodge 138 should this alternative be chosen.

**Section 3:** The corridor will potentially cause access impacts to the Orangeville Rise of Lost River Nature Preserve, Orangeville Community Center and parcels of the Hoosier National Forest.

### Alternative P

**Section 2:** See Alternative C.

**Section 3:** The Alternative P western Loogootee bypass will cause direct impacts to the Loogootee Loop West Boggs Park planned trail system, while the eastern bypass will result in access and cohesion impacts to the planned trail system and Martin County 4-H Fairgrounds. Both alternatives will result in access impacts to West Boggs Lake Park and Golf Course, West Boggs Trails and Mount Calvary Wildlife Management Area.

## 3.3.5.3 Religious Institutions

See **Section 5.3** and **Table 4-3** in **Appendix DD**.

### Alternative B

There are eight religious institutions within one mile of the corridor. One institution, Pleasant Hill Church, would experience potential access impacts.

### Alternative C

There are 12 religious institutions within one mile of the corridor, six of which could experience access impacts. Two





institutions, Calvary Baptist Church and Fellowship Baptist Church, are located within the corridor and could potentially receive direct and access impacts. Additionally, Antioch Church is likely to receive direct impacts as it is located along US 50 near the I-69 interchange in Montgomery. Local improvements could temporarily impede access to Redeemer Lutheran Church in Jasper during the construction phase.

### Alternative M

There are 31 religious institutions within one mile of the corridor, six of which could experience access impacts. Two institutions along Alternative M could potentially be directly impacted. One institution, Gospel Lighthouse Church, is anticipated to have direct impacts as it is located within the potential interchange footprint of Alternative M and SR 37.

### Alternative O

There are 26 religious institutions within one mile of the corridor. Calvary Baptist Church and Nicholson Valley Church are located within the corridor and are expected to have direct impacts. Local improvements could temporarily impede access to Redeemer Lutheran Church in Jasper during the construction phase.

### Alternative P

There are 27 religious institutions within one mile of the corridor. Seven of these could experience access impacts. Four additional institutions along Alternative P lie within the corridor and could receive direct impacts. These include Calvary Baptist Church, Fellowship Baptist Church, Truelove Church and Mount Olive Church.

The western Loogootee bypass causes no direct impacts to religious institutions. The eastern Loogootee bypass may result in the direct impact of Truelove Church.

## 3.3.5.4 Public Safety Facilities

For this study, public safety facilities are defined as emergency medical services and stations, fire stations and police stations (see **Table 4-4** in **Appendix DD**).

### Alternative B

Two public safety facilities were identified within one mile of the corridor. The Harrison Township Volunteer Fire Department lies adjacent to the corridor and could potentially receive access and travel time impacts.

### Alternative C

Three public safety facilities were identified within one mile of the corridor. One facility, the Haysville Volunteer Fire Department, would be close enough to the corridor that it could experience access impacts. Additionally, local improvements could temporarily impede access and alter response times to Indiana State Police District 34 and Jasper Volunteer Fire Department Station 3 during the construction phase.

### Alternative M

Seven public safety facilities were identified within one mile of the corridor. Three of these facilities could potentially experience access and or travel time impacts. One facility, the Martin County Civil Defense and Fire, is located within the corridor on US 50 and could experience direct impacts. Local improvements could temporarily impede access and alter response times to Indiana State Police District 34 and Jasper Volunteer Fire Department Station 3 during the construction phase.

### Alternative O

Eight public safety facilities were identified within one mile of the corridor. The corridor could impact access and response time of the Orange County Rural Fire Department. No direct impacts are expected. Additionally, local improvements could temporarily impede access and alter response times to Indiana State Police District 34 and Jasper



Volunteer Fire Department Station 3 in Jasper, and the Orange County Rural Fire Department on SR 145 during the construction phase.

### Alternative P

Ten public safety facilities were identified within one mile of the corridor. Both Alternative P<sub>w</sub> and P<sub>e</sub> could cause potential access and response time impacts to the four public safety facilities within the town of Loogootee. Additionally, Alternative P<sub>e</sub> could have access and response time impacts to the Martin County Civil Defense and Fire facility.

### 3.3.5.5 Major Health Care Facilities

Health care facilities are defined as including hospital clinics, rural health clinics, hospitals and specialty hospitals, addiction treatment centers, pharmacies, urgent care facilities and other medical care facilities such as nursing homes and rehabilitation facilities. See **Table 4-5 in Appendix DD**.

### Alternative B

One healthcare facility was identified within one mile of the corridor. No facility impacts are expected.

### Alternative C

Three healthcare facilities were identified within one mile of the corridor. No facility impacts are expected. Local improvements could temporarily impede access to Walgreens Store 10340 in Jasper during the construction phase.

### Alternative M

Ten healthcare facilities were identified within one mile of the corridor. No facility impacts are expected. Local improvements could temporarily impede access to Walgreens Store 10340 in Jasper during the construction phase.

### Alternative O

Nine healthcare facilities were identified within one mile of the corridor. One facility, Gentle Care of French Lick nursing home, could potentially experience access impacts. Two facilities in Mitchell, Mitchell Manor and a CVS Pharmacy, could experience direct impacts as they are located on or near SR 37. Local improvements could temporarily impede access to Walgreens Store 10340 in Jasper during the construction phase.

### Alternative P

Seven healthcare facilities were identified within one mile of the corridor. The eastern Loogootee bypass may impact rural eastern Martin County's access to the four healthcare facilities in Loogootee. No significant impacts to healthcare facilities are expected from the western Loogootee bypass. Local improvements could temporarily impede access to Walgreens Store 10340 in Jasper during the construction phase.

### 3.3.5.6 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

**Table 3-1 in Appendix DD** includes a full list of bicycle and pedestrian mobility and facilities within the two-mile buffer. Three bicycle and pedestrian facilities, the Jasper Riverwalk, Loogootee Loop- Phase 1 and the Milwaukee Rail Trail – Lawrence/Martin County Line west to Indian Springs have been identified that could potentially have cohesion impacts along the Mid States Corridor. Alternatives C, M, O and P all include potential impacts to trails. Alternative B will not impact any bicycle or pedestrian facilities. Local improvements are not anticipated to impact bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

### Alternative C

**Section 2 (Same for C, M, O and P):** The Jasper Riverwalk is a 2.25 mile out and back multi-use trail that follows the Patoka River in southcentral Jasper. The corridor would pass within two miles of the trail if Alternative C is selected as the preferred corridor. Minor impacts related to changes in travel time and access to the trail are expected for rural residents east of Jasper.





**Section 3:** There is no spatial data indicating trails used for bicycle or pedestrian transportation within the two-mile buffer of Section 3 that are expected to be impacted.

## Alternative M

**Section 2:** See 1.1.4.1 Section 2.

**Section 3:** The Loogootee Loop Trail is a planned, two-part trail system that would connect Loogootee to West Boggs Park in the town of Loogootee. The first section, Loogootee Loop, is a 1.6-mile trail on the eastern edge of Loogootee. The second section, County Line Trail to West Boggs Park, is a 2.7-mile trail that will connect with the northern extent of the Loogootee Loop and continue north to West Boggs Park. The corridor would pass within two miles of the planned trail system. Minor cohesion impacts to the planned trail system, such as accessibility and changes in travel time, are anticipated to occur.

The Milwaukee Rail Trail is an 11-mile trail that extends from Bedford to Williams in Lawrence County. There are plans to extend the trail from Williams into Martin County and Indian Springs in two additional segments. The corridor would go through this planned second segment. Impacts would depend on facility type and ability to be crossed via an underpass/overpass or at-grade intersection.

## Alternative O

**Section 2:** See 1.1.4.1 Section 2.

**Section 3:** There is no spatial data indicating trails used for bicycle or pedestrian transportation within a two-mile buffer of Alternative O.

## Alternative P

**Section 2:** See 1.1.4.1 Section 2.

**Section 3:** Alternative P<sub>e</sub>, the eastern Loogootee bypass, if selected as the preferred corridor, would pass within two miles of the planned Loogootee Loop two-part trail system. Minor cohesion impacts related to accessibility and changes in travel time would be anticipated.

The western Loogootee bypass, if chosen as the preferred corridor, would go through the second section of the County Line Trail to West Boggs Park. Impacts would depend on facility type and ability to be crossed via an underpass/overpass or at-grade intersection.

## 3.3.6 Mitigation

Close coordination and consultation with local communities will provide guidance for the development of appropriate measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate social impacts. These measures may vary depending on facility type and may include, as appropriate, the construction of access and frontage roads, overpasses for existing roads, noise barriers, landscaping and specially developed plans for the maintenance of traffic during construction.

## 3.3.7 Summary

All of the alternatives have the potential to impact the school corporations they traverse. There does not appear to be a greater impact to school corporations from one alternative to another. All alternatives may result in relocation or access impacts to a number of educational facilities.

Many of the recreational facilities are located on the outskirts of larger communities. Therefore, many of the qualitative impacts mentioned are associated with potentially modified access to these facilities from the surrounding



communities.

All alternatives could potentially cause direct impacts to religious properties or facilities or could result in altered travel patterns and connectivity with neighboring communities.

Impacts to public safety facilities could be both positive and negative. Many potential impacts reduce access to communities and counties which rely on the same public safety facility.

Access to health care facilities, especially emergency centers and hospitals, is critical. Facilities servicing a large area can be positively impacted by a new highway facility in terms of reduced travel times from neighboring communities. Potential negative impacts include increasing travel time for some individuals to medical facilities due to access modifications. These are anticipated to be offset by the overall reduced travel times for most residents.

Generally, Alternatives M and O in the Northeast Family have higher social impacts. Alternatives B and C in the Northwest Family have lower social impacts. Alternative P, the preferred alternative, in the North Central Family has mid-range impacts. For educational facilities, Alternative P, along with Alternative B, has one direct impact whereas Alternatives M and O have three, and Alternative C has two. Alternative P has one direct impact to a planned trail system near Loogootee. Alternatives B, C and O have no direct impacts to recreational facilities while Alternative M would result in three direct impacts to recreational facilities. For religious institutions, Alternative P has three direct and/or relocation impacts to religious facilities while Alternative B has zero direct impacts, Alternative O has one direct impact, and Alternatives C and M have two direct impacts. Though all alternatives could result in access impacts to several public safety facilities, Alternatives B, C and O will not result in any direct impacts. Alternative M will directly impact one public safety facility. The preferred alternative, Alternative P will potentially cause direct impacts to one public safety facility should the eastern bypass be chosen around Loogootee. Alternative P would result in access impacts to seven healthcare facilities. Alternative O would result in direct impacts to two healthcare facilities. No direct impacts to healthcare facilities are associated with Alternative P.