



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 4

 3.3.3.3 Travel Patterns and Accessibility 5

 3.3.3.4 Organizations and Institutions 6

 3.3.3.5 Recreational Facilities 7

 3.3.3.6 Religious Institutions..... 8

 3.3.3.7 Public Safety Facilities 9

 3.3.3.8 Major Health Care Facilities 10

 3.3.3.9 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities..... 11

 3.3.4 Mitigation..... 12

 3.3.5 Summary..... 13



3.3 SOCIAL IMPACTS

3.3.1 Introduction and Background

The following substantive changes have been made to this section since the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was published:

- Impacts for Alternative R and Refined Preferred Alternative P (RPA P) have been added.
- Minor edits have been included to clarify potential impacts and planning for Tier 2.

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. Other than Alternatives R and RPA P2, 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 are 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.

References to Sections 2 and 3 in this chapter refer to **Figure 2-2 in Chapter 2**, not Sections of Independent Utility (SIU). Section 1 of the project (SR 66 to I-64) and the existing SR 37 segments of Alternatives M and O are treated as insignificant at a Tier 1 level and are not included in the analysis. Section 2 is predominantly in Dubois County. Section 3 includes the area from the White River/SR 56 to the northern terminus.

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. Refined Preferred Alternative P (RPA P) impacts the most communities, at nine cities and nine rural communities, however, Alternative R has the greatest impact to neighborhood and community cohesion. 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 the alternative ends south of the East Fork White River at Haysville. Section 3 of Alternative C begins at US 231 north of Haysville on the north side of the East Fork White River. 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 alternative. Section 2 of RPA P is identical to Section 2 of Alternative C. Section 3 of RPA P will have four variations near Loogootee; two variations to the east, and one to the west near US 50, and one variation through Loogootee along the existing US 231. All the variations will pass the same communities along the existing US 231 (**Figure 2-3 in Appendix DD**). RPA P2 travels through Loogootee along the existing US 231 and would internally divide the communities of Loogootee in an east/west fashion. The near east variation, RPA P3, would divide the community of Scenic Hill from Loogootee. The far east variation, RPA P4, would divide the small population at Mount Pleasant from Loogootee. There are potential community and cohesion impacts if Scenic Hill and Mount Pleasant rely on Loogootee for services. North of Loogootee, RPA P would pass a cluster of communities including Bramble, Rattlesville, Burns City, Odon and Farlen. These communities are currently served by US 231 as well as multiple local county roads. Neither Alternative P nor RPA P will 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. RPA P terminates at I-69 near Crane and Scotland. The entirety of Alternative R follows along the existing US 231 beginning north of I-64 and Dale and terminating at I-69 near Crane and Scotland. Alternative R would traverse the cities of Huntingburg, Jasper, and Loogootee and cause a significant number of residential relocations as well as split the historic fabric of these communities and result in major disruptions of community cohesion. Additionally, smaller communities along Alternative R, such as Bramble and Farlen, have the potential for nearly half of the residents to be relocated.



Because relocation impacts can lead to community cohesion impacts, it's important to consider potential relocation data. Alternative R could result in significant impacts to social cohesion in the cities of Huntingburg, Jasper and Loogootee, as could Alternative RPA P2 in Loogootee. See **Chapter 3.5 Relocation Impacts, Table 3.5-1**. Alternative R would result in the relocation of 104 businesses and institutions. By comparison, the alternative with the next-highest business and institutional relocations is Alternative M with 24 to 27. Alternative R would result in the relocation of 282 residences. By comparison, Alternative M has the next-highest residential relocations at 127 to 144. Alternative R has a much higher level of social impacts than any other alternative. In the following analysis, other alternatives' social impacts are assessed by considering changes in access to existing businesses and institutions. Relocations due to Alternative R result in impacts to social cohesion far greater than those of any other alternative. As discussed in the sections below, relocation impacts can also contribute to religious and social community impacts, as well as impacts to organizations and institutions.

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 alternative increases. The number of communities or alternatives identified does not reflect an inherent greater degree of impact. All the alternatives, except for Alternatives R and RPA P2, either avoid 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. RPA P will pass within two miles of eight to nine cities and nine communities.

3.3.3.2 Religious and Social Communities

Given the unique nature of the Amish community, special effort was made to accommodate its needs and remove barriers to project input. Early project efforts focused on forming relationships within the community and identifying best practices for providing project information and providing feedback. These relationships and best practices were key to establishing good communication channels. 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, P, or RPA 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 alternative, 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 DD**). 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. If selected, 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.

RPA P

Project team members were able to hold two additional meetings with the Daviess/Martin County Amish communities in November 2022 as part of an ongoing outreach effort. North of Loogootee, RPA P1 is located west of US 231 and travels north to I-69, following the same alignment as the western variation of Alternative P. As mentioned above, Amish communities reside to the west of US 231. Based upon this information, there are potential quantitative and qualitative impacts if RPA P1 is selected. The level of impacts, which may include relocations, changes to access, safety and travel patterns, for RPA P1 would be nearly identical to Alternative P's western variation and would depend on facility type and final alignment. Alternatives RPA P2, P3 and P4 would have low impact access, safety and travel patterns for Amish communities. Tier 2 studies will determine which of the four RPA P variations (P1-P4) is selected.

3.3.3.3 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, with the exception of Alternatives R and RPA P2, 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. Feedback from members of Amish communities within the study area reinforced this concern acknowledging that altered access can add distance and significant time to their daily travel. Specific changes will be assessed as part of the Tier 2 NEPA studies. A range of alternatives around Loogootee (RPA P1, P2, P3 and P4) will be assessed to minimize local access disruptions.

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.



3.3.3.4 Organizations and 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

Alternative B 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, P, and RPA P): Alternative C will potentially impact Dr. Ted's Musical Marvels Museum north of I-64, noted previously.

Section 3: The alternative will go between the Pleasantview Christian Day School and Montgomery, which could impede access between the two. The Legacy Learning Center, a private preschool/childcare facility operating out of Antioch Bible Church, is near the 2,000-foot alternative 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 alternative. 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 Alternative O, Hatfield Elementary School and Mitchell Head Start. No direct impacts are anticipated for Hatfield Elementary School based on its location relative to the alternative. 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: No direct impacts are anticipated for Alternative P. The western variation of Alternative P at Loogootee would traverse the Barr-Reeve Community School Corporation. The eastern variation 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 variation would also divide the Community Learning Center of Martin County from Loogootee, causing cohesion impacts.

Alternative R

Section 2: Alternative R has the potential to directly impact access to Dr. Ted's Musical Marvels Museum, Southridge Middle School, Southridge High School Huntingburg Public Library, Fifth Street Elementary School, Tenth Street School, Jasper-Dubois County Public Library and Annex, and John Paul the Great Catholic High School. The alternative also traverses the Southwest Dubois County School Corporation and the Greater Jasper Consolidated Schools



Corporation and the Northeast Dubois County School Corporation before continuing on to Section 3. This may impact bus routes and access to schools during construction.

Section 3: Alternative R has the potential to directly impact the Loogootee Headstart Center, Loogootee Public Library, West Elementary, and Loogootee Jr./Sr. High School. The alternative traverses the Loogootee Community School Corporation, North Daviess Community Schools Corporation, and Bloomfield School District. This may impact bus routes and school access during construction.

RPA P

Section 2: See Alternative C.

Section 3: Potential impacts for RPA P match the impacts of Alternative P with the exception of RPA P2. Impacts for RPA P2 include relocations for Loogootee Headstart Center and the Loogootee Public Library in addition to the relocation of Dr. Ted's Musical Marvels Museum which is shared by all RPA P variations. All variations of RPA P cross through portion of the Loogootee Community School Corporation, Barr-Reeve Community School Corporation, North Daviess Community School Corporation, and Bloomfield School District. Impacts to school access and bus routes are similar to Alternative P.

3.3.3.5 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

Alternative B 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, P, and RPA P): Alternative C could cause access impacts to, Haysville Park, Buffalo Pond Nature Preserve and Sultan's Run Golf Course. Sultan's Run Golf Course, Knebel Lake, and Briedenbaugh Lake 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 alternative 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 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 alternative 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 variation will cause direct impacts to the Loogootee Loop West Boggs Park planned trail system, while the eastern variation 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, Mount Calvary Wildlife Management Area, and Gantz Woods Nature Preserve.

Alternative R

Section 2: Alternative R will result in direct impacts to multiple trails within the Jasper Multi-Use Pathway planned trail system, the Jasper Parklands Perimeter Trail, Memorial Gymnasium, Fromme Wildlife Habitat Area, Barnes-Seng Wetland Conservation Area, Library Park, Jasper Municipal Golf Course, Jasper Parklands, and State Police Park.

Section 3: The alternative will cause direct impacts to the Loogootee Loop West Boggs Park planned trail system, West Boggs Park – Chimney Creek Trail, and Fountain Square Park in Loogootee. North of Loogootee the alternative will cause direct impacts to West Boggs Park and Gantz Woods Nature Preserve. Additional coordination with West Boggs Park would be required if Alternative R is the selected preferred alternative.

RPA P

Section 2: See Alternative C.

Section 3: For RPA P1 and RPA P4, impacts to recreational areas are similar to Alternative P's western and eastern variations, respectively. The RPA P2 variation has similar impacts to Alternative R. The RPA P3 variation would only cause direct impacts to the Gantz Woods Nature Preserve.

3.3.3.6 Religious Institutions

Religious institutions often contribute to the identity and culture of a community. Impacts to these institutions are detailed in **Section 5.3** and **Table 4-3** in **Appendix DD**.

Alternative B

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

Alternative C

There are 12 religious institutions within one mile of Alternative C, six of which could experience access impacts. One institution, Fellowship Baptist Church is located within the alternative and Calvary Baptist Church lies adjacent to the alternative. Both facilities 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 Alternative M, 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 Alternative O. Nicholson Valley Church is located within the alternative and Calvary Baptist Church is adjacent to the alternative. Both religious institutions 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 24 religious institutions within one mile of Alternative P. Seven of these could experience access impacts. Four institutions along Alternative P lie within or are adjacent to the alternative and could receive direct impacts. These include Calvary Baptist Church, Fellowship Baptist Church, Truelove Church and Mount Olive Church.

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

Alternative R

There are 44 religious institutions within one mile of Alternative R. Approximately 15 institutions, Huntingburg Seventh-day Adventist Church, First Baptist Church, Church of Nazarene, Central Christian Church, Christ Lutheran Church, Trinity United Church of Christ, Calvary Apostolic Church, St. Joseph Church, Redeemer Lutheran Church, Fellowship Baptist Church, St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Loogootee Church of Christ, Loogootee United Methodist Church, St. John's Lutheran Church, and Faith Fellowship Assembly of God, could potentially receive direct and access impacts.

RPA P

Depending on the variation, there are 23-24 institutions within one mile of RPA P. RPA P1, P3 and P4 could cause access impacts to Calvary Baptist Church, Fellowship Baptist Church, and Mount Olive Church as these institutions lie adjacent to the variation. RPA P2 is the only variation that could result in direct or relocation impacts. Loogootee Church of Christ, Loogootee United Methodist Church, St. John's Lutheran Church, and Faith Fellowship Assembly of God are located within the RPA P2 variation and could potentially receive direct impacts.

3.3.3.7 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 Alternative B. The Harrison Township Volunteer Fire Department lies adjacent to the alternative and could potentially receive access and travel time impacts.

Alternative C

Three public safety facilities were identified within one mile of Alternative C. One facility, the Haysville Volunteer Fire Department, would be close enough to the alternative 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 Alternative M. 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 alternative 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 Alternative O. The alternative 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 Alternative P. Both the western and eastern variations could cause potential access and response time impacts to the four public safety facilities within the town of Loogootee. Additionally, the eastern variation could have access and response time impacts to the Martin County Civil Defense and Fire facility.

Alternative R

There are 14 public safety facilities within one mile of Alternative R. In addition to altering response times and impeding access to these 14 facilities, the alternative could also result in direct impacts to the Jasper Volunteer Fire Department – Station 3, Loogootee Volunteer Fire Department, Martin County Ambulance Service Limited Liability Company, Loogootee Fire Department, Loogootee Police Department, and Indiana State Police – District 34 in Jasper.

RPA P

Ten public safety facilities were identified within one mile of RPA P. RPA P2 is the only variation that could result in direct impacts. The Loogootee Fire Department, Loogootee Volunteer Fire Department, Martin County Ambulance Service Limited Liability Company, and Loogootee Police Department are located within the RPA P2. RPA P1, RPA P3, and RPA P4 could cause potential access and response time impacts to the four public safety facilities within the town of Loogootee.

3.3.3.8 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 Alternative B. No facility impacts are expected.

Alternative C

Six healthcare facilities were identified within one mile of Alternative C. No direct 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 Alternative M. No direct 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 Alternative O. 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 Alternative P. The eastern Loogootee variation may impact rural eastern Martin County's access to the four healthcare facilities in Loogootee. The western Loogootee variation may impact rural western Daviess County's access to the four healthcare facilities in Loogootee. Local improvements could temporarily impede access to Walgreens Store 10340 in Jasper during the construction phase.

Alternative R

There are 18 healthcare facilities within one mile of Alternative R. Five facilities, CVS Store 6881, Urgent Care of Huntingburg, CVS Store 6878, Walgreens Store 10340, and CVS Store 6883 could experience direct and access impacts as they are located within the alternative. The remaining 13 facilities could experience access impacts.

Alternative RPA P

Seven healthcare facilities were identified within one mile of RPA P. RPA P2 is the only variation that could result in direct impacts. CVS Store 6883 is located within the RPA P2 variation along US 231 and could experience access and direct impacts. The RPA P1 would cause access and cohesion impacts to rural residents living west of Loogootee from the health care facilities located within Loogootee. Likewise, RPA P3 and RPA P4 would cause access and cohesion impacts to rural residents living east of Loogootee from the health care facilities located within Loogootee.

3.3.3.9 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, P, R and RPA 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, P and RPA P): The Jasper Riverwalk is a 2.25 mile out and back multi-use trail that follows the Patoka River in southcentral Jasper. Alternative C would pass within two miles of the trail if Alternative C is selected as the preferred alternative. 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 Alternative C 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. Alternative M 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 alternative 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 Alternative C 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 Alternative C Section 2.

Section 3: The eastern Loogootee variation of Alternative P, if selected as the preferred alternative, 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 variation of Alternative P, if chosen as the preferred alternative, 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.

Alternative R

Section 2: Alternative R would directly impact four planned trail systems and one open trail in Jasper. The Truman to 12th Ave. Ball Fields Ruxer Golf Course Trail, Riverwalk to Municipal Golf Course Trail, Municipal Golf Course to Bockelman Park Trail, and Bockelman Park Trail to Jasper Middle School are all segments of a planned trail system to encircle the City of Jasper. The alternative would intersect all these trails. The Jasper Parklands – Perimeter Trail is a 1.62 open loop trail in Jasper. Impacts would depend on facility type and the ability for the planned trail to cross Alternative R with an underpass, overpass, or at-grade intersection.

Section 3: The alternative will directly impact two planned trail systems (Loogootee Loop – Phase 1, and County Line Trail to W. Boggs Park), 1 open trail (Chimney Creek Trail), and cause access impacts to an additional three trails in West Boggs Park. Impacts would depend on facility type and the ability for the planned trail to cross Alternative R with an underpass, overpass, or at-grade intersection.

RPA P

Section 2: See Alternative C Section 2.

Section 3: Impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities for RPA P1, RPA P3, and RPA P4 are consistent with Alternative P Section 3. Impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities for RPA P2 are consistent with Alternative R Section 3.

3.3.4 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. Specific coordination with impacted school districts will be completed during Tier 2 to address bus routes that may be impacted and minimize potential impacts through Tier 2 access planning.



3.3.5 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.

Given their unique transportation needs as well as religious and lifestyle practices, Amish communities are particularly vulnerable to social impacts from this project. Alternatives O, P, and RPA P have higher potential for impacts to these communities.

Generally, Alternatives M and O in the Northeast Family and Alternative R in the North Central Family have higher social impacts. Alternatives B and C in the Northwest Family have lower social impacts. Alternative P and RPA P in the North Central Family have mid-range impacts. For educational facilities, Alternative P, along with Alternative B, has one direct impact whereas Alternatives M and O have three, Alternative C has two, RPA P has a range of one to three, and Alternative R has ten. RPA P has a range of three to six direct impacts to recreational facilities depending on which variation at Loogootee is selected. Alternative B has no direct impacts to recreational facilities. Alternatives C and O have two direct impacts to recreational facilities while Alternative M would result in four direct impacts to recreational facilities. Alternative P has three to four direct impacts depending on the variation. Alternative R has 18 direct impacts to recreational facilities. For religious institutions, RPA P has a range of zero to four direct impacts to religious facilities while Alternative B has zero direct impacts, and Alternatives M and P have two direct impacts, Alternative C has three direct impacts, Alternative P has four direct impacts, Alternative R has 15 direct impacts to religious facilities. Though all alternatives could result in access impacts to several public safety facilities, Alternatives B, C, O, and P will not result in any direct impacts. Alternative M will directly impact one public safety facility. RPA P will potentially cause direct impacts to four public safety facilities should the RPA P2 variation be chosen at Loogootee. Alternative R will directly impact six public safety facilities. Alternative B, C, M, and P have zero direct impacts to healthcare facilities. Alternative O would result in direct impacts to two healthcare facilities. Alternative R would result in five direct impacts to healthcare facilities. RPA P has a range of zero to one direct impact on healthcare facilities. No direct impacts to healthcare facilities are associated with RPA P1, RPA P3, and RPA P4.

