Introduction

Transportation and land use development patterns have been intertwined since the earliest patterns of settlement. In the past, settlements were just as likely to influence transportation decisions as they were to be influenced by transportation patterns. However, today's transportation patterns have often formed a more dispersed and disconnected physical foundation for the communities they serve. The present pattern of dispersed, sprawled development increases our dependence on the automobile at an alarming rate. Unlike past urban development patterns, which emphasized pedestrian-oriented activities and designs, newer development patterns have been planned around the ability to travel longer distances in an automobile. These new patterns have encouraged sprawl and produced consequences such as reduced mobility, accessibility, environmental quality, open space and farmland, and community density. As a result, many residents, specifically those without access to a car, have a limited ability to share in the new urban and suburban development patterns. Although pedestrians will not replace the car in the near future, it is important to plan for pedestrian and alternative modal choices in order to reduce automotive dependence.

This plan was developed in response to the series of issues, constraints, and opportunities identified through an extensive series of public input meetings and surveys. The most prominent issue in the public meetings was that growth must be more orderly and focused. Additionally, citizens expressed that growth should occur near urban centers that have public utilities, infrastructure, and other amenities in place. Many public participants noted that the preservation of agriculture and sensitive, natural lands was a priority to maintain the way of life central to the county. Central to these issues was the concern that with suburban sprawl, the negative impacts of more traffic, more noise, more loss of land, and more loss of rural character were evident daily. Citizens expressed that with suburban sprawl they were losing the present quality of life within the county. These concerns set the tone for the development of the transportation plan.

The Transportation Plan integrates policies and issues addressed throughout the planning process that were previously addressed in Chapters A, B, and C. This element of the Comprehensive Plan proposes to direct future development to cities and towns, while designating specific growth areas that will protect the agricultural industry and conserve our rural and natural environments through the development of a more diverse set of transportation alternatives. To effectively direct future land development, the transportation plan and the land use plan must work together hand in hand due to the relationship and impact each has on the other. These directives will be met by using strategies that provide a broader range of transportation alternatives which are centered on land development that supports in-fill in urban areas, build-out of current sprawl, and reasonable urban growth centered around our municipalities and infrastructure.

Existing Conditions and Trends

Current Transportation System

The following section was derived primarily from information provided by the Anderson/Madison County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO/MCCOG). Other information was gathered from a variety of sources, such as the 1990 U.S. Census, traffic volume counts, corridor and intersection studies, interchange studies, land use data, and other studies/data collected from local, state, and federal sources.

Roads: Madison County's approximately 930 miles of roadway offer an extensive network of linkages to local urban, inter-County, and interstate connections within the County. The following is an approximate breakdown of mileage in the unincorporated sections of the county: Interstate 17.95 miles; Arterials 141.35 miles; Collectors 243.04; and Local Roads 545.61. Roads in the unincorporated area are laid out

in a typical grid road pattern associated with square mile sections of land. With the exception of boundary roads, maintenance of facilities falls to the entity that has jurisdiction over the asset. For example, cities and towns are responsible for maintaining roadways located inside of incorporated areas. Boundary roads, on the other hand, have maintenance determined by inter-local agreements. State highways and the Interstates are owned and maintained by the Indiana State Department of Transportation (INDOT). The local road network is extensive, and travel patterns tend to be greater on north/south links due to the nature of the County's geography, road network, and development patterns.

Rail: Madison County's rail system is characterized by good connections to regional and national hubs for extended service. Three rail companies service the County: CSX, Norfolk-Southern, and Indiana Central Western Railroad companies. CSX owns the primary north-south link in the County, known as the Indianapolis-Cleveland line. Norfolk-Southern operates the main east-west line through northern Madison County. Both of these companies provide service connections to the City of Anderson. Indiana Central Western has a small local line that services the grain elevators in the Town of Lapel.

Air: The County has three small airports that service local traffic. Alexandria and Elwood have very small airports which service local recreational pilots. Anderson has a commercially rated airport that handles a considerable amount of traffic flow each year. Anderson Aviation operates out of this facility and provides local and national freight service. The majority of commercial passenger service to state, national, and international airports is provided by the Indianapolis International Airport (located near the junction of Interstate 70 and Interstate 465), and is approximately a one hour drive from most locations in Madison County.

As freight business has increased, airport officials have begun to carefully consider the future need for a larger facility. According to Steve Darlington, manager of the Anderson Municipal Airport, the facility appears ready to handle additional growth; however, he has noted that a new facility might eventually prove helpful in sustaining the growth of the airport's freight business. While the airport has displayed the potential for future fiscal growth, there is virtually no potential for physical growth at the current site (due to surrounding development). Mr. Darlington also noted that Indianapolis is in need of a regional reliever airport, and that surrounding sites in the existing metropolitan area are not considered capable of handling the necessary demand. Further research indicated that if the airport were located in Madison County, the site of the facility should either be located northeast of the current Anderson facility near I-69 or southwest of Pendleton along I-69.

Transit: Madison County retains two transit providers within its jurisdiction. The CATS transit system services only the City of Anderson, and has both fixed route and demand response service. The TRAM system is a demand response service operated by the Madison County (through a private provider), and covers the entire County.

Out-migration from Urban Cores

Demographic and economic data from the 1990 U.S. Census illustrates a greater dispersion of population and more complex travel patterns in Madison County since 1980. This analysis is supported by trends in the County between 1970 and 1990, in which a sizable proportion of the local population moved from the urban areas (Indianapolis, Anderson and smaller municipalities) out into the unincorporated areas of Madison County. The impact of Anderson's out-migration has been significant in Richland, Adams, Union, and Fall Creek Townships (Refer to **Map A-4-7,** Population Change). A significant portion of this population has requested new housing in the form of manufactured and single-family homes located on re-zoned parcels of agricultural land adjacent to the County roadway system. In most cases, these new residential properties have required a driveway cut, and have consequently increased traffic and access conflict points on local roads.

Influence of Indianapolis Metropolitan Region

According to state statistics and local traffic data, motorists are making a greater number of vehicle trips to the Indianapolis metropolitan area on a daily basis. Vehicles traveling to the larger metropolitan area come not only from Madison County, but also from the adjacent counties of Hamilton, Henry, Delaware, Grant, and Hancock. Unfortunately, the growth in travel demand and the resultant commuting patterns have impacted most county roads as well as the federal, state, and urban networks of the Indianapolis Metropolitan area. A substantial percentage of the higher volume traffic loading comes from out-of-county commuters that use the local network to make their connections to the larger urban, state, federal road network. Among those areas affected by this traffic are portions of Green and Fall Creek Townships. County roads were not designed to handle higher traffic volumes, and there are no future increases to the financial resources available to make any of the necessary improvements.

Interstate 69 Corridor

Growth along the I-69 Corridor has become a great concern, specifically near and adjacent to the interchanges. This pattern is expected to escalate as the Indianapolis metropolitan area and Madison County become more economically inter-dependent. Requests concerning development potential and land availability have increased substantially for commercial and industrial uses at the interchanges, and large tracts of land are under development at the time of writing. Considering the potential and expected inter-county travel patterns, planning efforts must be focused toward a more comprehensive approach towards transportation and land use, paying particular attention to potential impacts on the rural landscape of the County.

Growth Dispersion

Increased growth is anticipated for Stony Creek and Green Townships due to their close proximity to the Indianapolis metropolitan area. As growth in eastern Hamilton County and northern Hancock County moves east and northward, the effect of that expansion will flow into western and southern portions of Madison County, especially to areas near the Hamilton-Madison County line around I-69 and State Roads 13, 38, 37, and 67. Based on several data sources (MCCOG, Indianapolis MPO, and INDOT volume counts, and Census Journey To Work Data) it is estimated that expanded travel patterns will continue to increase, along with growing numbers of vehicle trips to the larger metropolitan area via the interstate, state, and county roads. Growth dispersion, along with out-migration from urban cores, creates these new travel patterns, which in many instances, impact the ability of the existing road network to safely and efficiently handle traffic. For example, as individual changes in land use intensity accumulate over time, the operating efficiency of the roadway network often becomes obsolete before its expected lifecycle is fulfilled.

Economic Development

The primary selection factor for locating new business and industry has consistently been highway access. In relation to Madison County, the transportation system will need to be upgraded to better facilitate the movement of goods and services. Known planned improvements are listed in the MPO 2025 Long Range Transportation Plan, found at the end of this chapter (page **D-1-10)**. Other improvements to the transportation network should be addressed more seriously if/when intense development is proposed. Meaningful truck routes, adequate transfer terminals, and quick access to regional markets are part of the transportation/economic development issue. Transportation resources should be protected and preserved in terms of their carrying capacity and ease of access for economic reasons. As the I-69 Corridor becomes more developed, concerns have been raised as to whether this vital transportation route and interchanges will be compromised due to unplanned growth patterns. If these routes and interchanges become compromised (eg. see **Congestion and Circulation** below), the County will lose an important local competitive advantage. Thus, it is imperative that existing roads be maintained and protected in terms of their ability to function at a high level of service without excessive expansion.

Congestion and Circulation

As development increases along main travel corridors, so does the congestion created along the corridor and at the site of the development. Increased development has not only increased the number of daily vehicle trips, but also the number of turning movements on and off the corridor (internal circulation). Consideration should be given to drafting plans that will provide more intensive guidance on road access and internal circulation to allow the roadway and adjoining land uses to benefit one another in an integrated system.

Planning Issues

Planning issues surrounding transportation were identified and discussed during the community participation components of the comprehensive planning process. Throughout the public workshops and focus group sessions, participants were encouraged to list the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to the transportation system in Madison County. The following is a summary of those discussions.

Scattered and Fragmented Development: The most critical issue identified was the need to improve growth management through effective controls. Throughout the public participation process, participants noted that growth was fragmented, poorly planned, and was destroying the rural character and agricultural nature of the County. While this issue was a concern to almost all participants in the process, there were substantial differences in opinion ranging from no growth to managing growth better. The following statements represent the issues raised concerning future development in relation to transportation:

- Development should be concentrated in the urban areas of the County to reduce travel times required to access services. Designated growth areas are necessary to insure orderly development patterns that can reduce the cost of road infrastructure and reduce the conversion of rural lands and open space.
- County roads were not designed to carry large volumes of traffic, with the exception of primary and minor arterials and some collectors. Intensive land use development will require improvements to the transportation network.
- Fragmented development and segregated land uses reduce the likelihood of providing alternative travel modes for access to most daily activities.
- Clustered, mixed-use development is preferred over strip and special use development so alternative modes of travel can be encouraged.
- Roadway networks should be laid out in grid patterns to disperse traffic, to encourage accessibility, and to promote alternative modes of travel.
- Better coordination should be promoted between governmental agencies, private entities, and the public in order to accomplish desired developments.

Access & Corridor Preservation: Accessibility is the key to moving people and goods. Modern development patterns require even greater accessibility because of their scattered and fragmented nature. All of the state highways in the County, particularly those linking the County to the metropolitan area, are being threatened by increasing single-family home or business access demands. In many instances providing additional direct access points would increase congestion and air emissions; both of these are contrary to the public safety interest and health. Community meeting participants discussed some of alternatives that may be investigated that will provide access into these facilities other than directly through permitted driveways. Other issues brought forth in this area included:

- Access onto county roads should be considered based on its impact on the surrounding area considering the accepted plan of land use and transportation and not just on a case-by-case basis. Access and corridor preservation must be considered together when making land use and transportation decisions impacting a travel corridor.
- State highways and certain high-use local roads must be protected from excessive driveway cuts, alternating lane configurations, poorly designed and spaced signals, and fragmented and disjointed land use planning.

- Primary emphasis should be given to traffic flow over access on higher functionally classified roads, such as highways and arterials. Traffic flow should have priority over access at signalized intersections whenever possible.

Interstates & Interchanges: Interstate 69 and the connection created from State Road 109 South to I-70 are vital for the prosperity of the County. Community meeting participants agreed that development at all interstate interchanges in Madison County had happened in a piecemeal fashion with no overall consideration to area land planning, mixed use, circulation patterns, modal alternatives, or mechanisms to control development. Interchanges 34, 26, 22, and 19 have been compromised to some extent in terms of future access to Interstate 69, and Exits 34 and 26 have been extensively developed. Only development at Exit19 (State Road 38) had been made using a comprehensive approach with policies in place to control access and land development adjacent to the interstate corridor. Some of the issues discussed included:

- Patterns of growth around the interstate interchanges must be controlled, and the potential impact it will have on the flow of traffic (both on and off the interstate) should be considered.
- Interchange areas should have stricter guidelines for growth, and should make space available for future use of alternative travel modes, (rail, bus, or ridesharing).
- Other designated growth areas should be developed before the interchange areas, unless the only choice is an interchange location.
- There is a need for greater coordination of development issues for those communities along the I- 69 Corridor.

Alternative Travel Modes: One of the areas consistently noted and identified throughout the planning process was the need to consider alternative transportation modes. During the public input sessions, comments were made that communities should become less dependent upon the automobile, as many daily needs could be met through walking or bicycling. Most participants agreed that the County should investigate the merits of the issues noted below:

- Development patterns should afford the opportunity for alternative modes of travel, including walking, bicycling, transit, and carpooling.
- Roadway design should incorporate features that are pedestrian friendly by implementing traffic calming measures, narrow streets, and greater accessibility through creative land use design.
- Boulevard designs are preferred for corridors that carry high traffic volumes.
- Commercial development should be designed with multi-modal access.
- Subdivisions should be required to have sidewalks.
- Regional connections for bike and pedestrian travel should be undertaken, and consideration should be given to carpooling, express bus service, and the development of a commuter rail to Indianapolis.

Financing Transportation Improvements: Financing growth had been a controversial topic throughout the community meetings. As development pushes more intensely into Madison County and its communities, the decision as to who should pay for improvements has become a complex issue. Government no longer has the ability to assist with high development and infrastructure costs, except in rare instances to benefit the public good. One of the biggest concerns voiced by participants at the public meetings was the question of who should pay for development and infrastructure maintenance. Some of the issues discussed included:

- Travel facilities should be designed and maintained at a higher level than in the past.
- Development costs should be the responsibility and burden of the developer, not simply placed on the existing taxpayer base. Amenities such as sidewalks and trails should also be provided and paid for by the developer.
- Right-of-way for future corridor growth, access, and alternative travel should be dedicated at the time of development to the appropriate governmental jurisdiction.

Environmental: Many negative impacts that stem from the increased use of the automobile were identified in the community meetings. Two of the primary environmental concerns (from increased automobile use and associated scattered development patterns) are the degradation of air and water resources. Of specific concern to Madison County is the Clean Air Act and recent amendments that could potentially impact the nature of travel and development. These new standards place Madison County with the metropolitan region in regards to non-attainment status on air quality. In effect, this decision has the potential to not only limit growth, but also to restrict the amount of federal dollars available to assist with any new road construction to add lane miles. Issues addressed by the public included:

- Transportation corridors should be tree lined boulevards or parkway designed, with an emphasis on aesthetics and pedestrian use.
- Subdivisions should require sidewalks that have street trees in the public right-of-way or a dedicated community association right-of-way.
- Greenbelts should be maintained around and between urban nodes or cores for alternative travel paths and environmental reasons.
- Linear greenways should be developed for alternative travel and to connect land uses and developments within communities and between communities.
- View sheds (what can be seen from particular locations) of important natural and built sites should be protected from obstructions and development.

Transportation Plan Policy

Policies form the basis of the Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Plan, and the Transportation Plan. This section of the document presents objectives and related strategies that were derived from the public input process used to formulate Section C of the Plan. Goals, Objectives, and Strategies noted below form the foundation for the impetus of the transportation element of this plan (note that strategies enumerated below may summarize those located in Section C under the goal statements). The recommendations in the last section present actions that can be undertaken to achieve the statements in the policy.

GOAL: Maintain, enhance, and create a more viable and versatile multi-modal transportation network in Madison County with improved linkages to and within the Indianapolis metropolitan region, which offer efficient, effective, and safe movement of people and goods.

Objective 1: Ensure a higher standard of transportation service and infrastructure for present and future development that improves the viability and safety of transportation systems and contributes to the maintenance and enhancement of the overall network.

Strategies:

1.1 Engineering design, judgment, and sound transportation planning should be key to decisions involving transportation.

1.2 Implement setback, build-to lines, and right-of-way standards that should encourage dedications for current and future planned developments for corridor preservation at time of approval.

1.3 Research and develop standards for an access control ordinance, including at a minimum dual access to all residential developments.

1.4 Assure that access cuts in new developments should not be closer than 300' from the street edge, as defined by ITE and INDOT in their access standards manual.

1.5 Develop standards for clearance zones for all intersections; standards may vary depending upon roadway facility type and adjoining land use.

1.6 Assure that access decisions are not made in a void to only one land use development; the entire corridor and future plans should be considered.

1.7 Develop a standards manual for traffic calming techniques for local and other streets.

1.8 Ensure that development intensity adheres to the appropriate current or planned functional road classification standards.
1.8 Design roadway networks in grid patterns to encourage alternative travel routes and modes.
1.9 Ensure all signalization is spaced for maximum progression of traffic flow on primary and minor arterials and collectors. Signalization on state routes should be discouraged.
1.10 Research and develop standards for developer paid fees or amenities for the total transportation network.

Objective 2: Ensure the improvement and enhancement of the interconnectivity of road systems and alternative travel modes, especially near urban centers, that should also include connections to the regional metropolitan area.

Strategies:

2.1 Develop corridor overlay zones to protect mobility and accessibility standards along all arterials.
2.2 Develop corridor preservation ordinance for long-term viability and capacity protection of all roads.
2.3 Ensure that all transportation linkages support the larger regional transportation system through integrated design and connectivity.
2.4 Participate in regional planning meetings with local municipalities, Indianapolis, adjacent counties, INDOT, transit entities, FHWA, and FTA to ensure cooperative, coordinated, and comprehensive future planning.
2.5 Develop transit-oriented land use standards to increase transit opportunities and connections for both local and regional connections.
2.6 Encourage alternative modal design standards to promote pedestrian and bike access and transit availability.
2.7 Encourage future connectivity in all subdivisions by stubbing streets for connections to future developments.
2.8 Minimize cul-de-sacs, except in conservation design subdivisions. Where cul-de-sacs are allowed outside of conservation subdivisions, easements should be granted for alternative travel connections and primarily pedestrian and bike connections.

Objective 3: Promote the use of alternative modes of transportation – such as ridesharing, bicycling, walking, and transit – and create development patterns that are conducive to these alternative travel networks.

Strategies:

3.1 Design priority should be given to developing a transportation network that supports livability through the following concepts:
- 3.1a Design should promote alternatives of travel choice and not concentrate strictly on vehicular travel.
- 3.1b Design should support the regional transportation system through integration major routes that connect major regional destinations while fully integrating and balancing alternatives for automobile, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and freight needs.
- 3.1c Design should support the economic vitality of the region as it relates to the movement of goods and services throughout the region.
- 3.1d Design should create pedestrian and bicycle accessibility by redirecting development efforts to support a more balanced multi-modal transportation system.
- 3.1e Design should provide orientation and identity to the region by assisting in the development of the character of the region and reinforcing urban form that enhances economic value of particular locations.
- 3.1f Design should provide a safe environment to reduce accidents and provide a sense of comfort and freedom for all modes of travel, particularly pedestrian.
- 3.1g Design should provide for physical comfort that is essential for livability.

3.1h Design should create street environments that encourage pedestrian activity and thus promote social contact.
3.1i Design should provide spatial definition by orienting buildings to the street.
3.1j Design should ensure and promote human scale, function, and sensory experience.
3.1k Design should maintain the quality of the environment.

3.2 Concentrate development near urban centers that emphasize compact land use patterns that promote accessibility by multi-modal alternatives.
3.3 Provide densities that promote land use within walking distance (normally ¼-1/2 mile) of transit stops to encourage alternative travel.
3.4 Promote mixed-use development to encourage and support walking and bicycle trips amongst uses and to transit.
3.5 Provide necessary building densities and land uses within walking distance of transit stops to promote a viable alternative to the automobile.
3.6 Design streets as the public spaces of the region that create comfortable and interesting environments for pedestrians to live, to work, and to play. Design should encourage pedestrian usage.

Objective 4: Promote compact development patterns with grid street configurations to reduce energy consumption, congestion, air pollution, and wasting of land resources.
Strategies:

4.1 Concentrate development near urban centers that emphasize compact land-use patterns to promote accessibility.
4.2 Promote mixed-use development to encourage and support walking and bicycle trips amongst uses and to transit.
4.3 Provide necessary building densities and land uses within walking distance of transit stops to promote a viable alternative to the automobile.
4.4 Support the element of shared space through good architectural and landscape design with an emphasis on pedestrian scale.
4.5 Design streets and buildings to accommodate safe and secure environments, but not at the expense of accessibility and openness.
4.6 Encourage design to promote connectivity of buildings, streets, and people.
4.7 Design streets as the public spaces of the region that create comfortable and interesting environments for pedestrians to live, to work, and to play. Design should encourage pedestrian usage.
4.8 Promote development and design patterns that encourage the reduction of vehicle trips and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).
4.9 Support development patterns that promote shorter trips, thereby reducing the negative impact vehicular travel has on air and water quality.

Objective 5: Explore and implement new standards that improve transportation systems and roadway configurations that include traffic calming measures, narrower residential streets, reasonable maximum road widths, and better signaling.
Strategies:

5.1 Develop traffic calming measures to be included in development standards.
5.2 Develop a broader functional classification system that provides flexibility, access, and mobility while promoting design in the roadway network and land use that supports the design requirements noted under Objective 3.
5.3 Reduce street widths in order to reduce speed, except for those that provide regional connectivity such as the interstate and highways outside of urban areas.
5.4 Ensure all signalization is spaced for maximum progression of traffic flow on primary and minor arterials and collectors. Signalization on state routes should be discouraged.

Objective 6: Involve transportation agencies and other stakeholders at all levels in the development review process when considering system provision and design, corridor preservation, and land-use impacts.

Strategies:

6.1 Improve coordination of land use and transportation planning between the local, state, and federal levels.

6.2 Support the increased early planning coordination efforts of local and state agencies involved in transportation and land use planning.

6.3 Promote the concurrency of transportation and land use planning, specifically when major development is anticipated.

6.4 Evaluate access and transportation impacts in terms of the Comprehensive Plan, and not on the basis of isolated, individual developments.

Recommendations

Transportation plans traditionally center on the conventional functional street classification system that focuses almost exclusively on two functional aspects: vehicular movement and access to adjacent property. This plan is predicated on the concepts of livability and multi-modal connectivity and options. Land use and transportation decisions should be made with regard to their impacts on each plan and not isolated and separate. The recommendations are enumerated below by mode of travel. This list is not exhaustive in nature. Additional projects from the MPO 2025 Long Range Transportation Plan have been included because of their relevance to all jurisdictions within Madison County. Madison County is a member of the MPO Policy Committee that approved this plan.

Roadways

1.1 Interstate 69: Entire Corridor: Corridor Preservation for future road expansion and high-speed rail access.

1.2 State Road 13: From Hancock County line to Lapel: Expansion to a four-lane divided facility with strict access control. Design should incorporate a boulevard-type median with service roads.

1.3 State Road 67/9: From I-69 to Hancock County Line: Expansion of facility based on MPO plan with varying cross-sections based on right-of-way with strict access control.

1.4 State Road 32 West: From Anderson Corporate Limits to Hamilton County Line: Expansion of facility with strict access control.

1.5 State Road 9 South: From junction with SR 67 to Hancock County Line: Expansion of facility with strict access control.

1.6 State Roads 36 and 38 East: East of Pendleton one mile: Expansion of facilities based on right-of-way with limited access.

1.7 State Road 109 South: South Anderson to Hancock County Line: Strict access control with long-term expansion.

1.8 Local arterials and arterials: Limit access and encourage right-of-way dedications and connectivity to all other roads in the system, with strong emphasis on multi-modal connectivity.

1.9 Local streets: Access and connectivity should be primary with emphasis on multi-modal connectivity and pedestrian scale.

Rail

1.1 Right-of-way should be dedicated to provide for Anderson to Noblesville commuter rail connection along the Indiana Central Western Rail line and its old connections from Lapel to Noblesville.

1.2 Right-of-way should be dedicated to provide for Anderson to Indianapolis commuter rail connection along the current CSX rail corridor.

1.3 Right-of-way should be dedicated to provide for high-speed rail access along Interstate 69.

Air

1.1 Study should commence to determine a location for a new regional relief airport of the Indianapolis Airport. Emphasis should be on multi-modal connectivity availability to the facility.

2025 Long Range Transportation Plan Project Descriptions

The following list of projects represent those included in the MPO 2025 Long Range Transportation Plan Update for all of Madison County. Projects identified in this list were derived from the following sources: the Long Range transportation model, special studies, corridor studies, public input, focus groups, surveys, and various officials from local, state, and federal government. These project descriptions have been included in order to provide further explanation and support to the transportation Goals, Objectives, and Recommendations in this Plan; in addition, it should be noted that the Planning Commission is not responsible for the development or the completion of any of the projects found in this list.

1. **SR 9 & Broadway/Business 9 Intersection.** The North Broadway junction with SR 9 serves as the Northern Gateway into the Anderson Corporate Limits. The Southbound approach of SR 9 is divided into left-turns onto SR 9 and through-lane movements onto Broadway. The 3,500 daily southbound left-turns oppose 5,000 to 6,000 northbound vehicles per day. These **high percentage turning conflicts and poor illumination** justify the need for an **intersection improvement and overhead lighting project**.

2. **SR 9, Between E. 3rd and E. 18th Streets.** This segment of SR 9 has one of the busiest sections of commercial/retail activity on the Anderson transportation network. The average daily traffic (ADT) ranges from 32,000 to 35,000 for a 24-hour period. The proximity of Anderson University and various residential neighborhoods to this SR 9 commercial segment creates the need for an improved **sidewalks and bikeways improvement project**.

3. **SR 9, Between SR 232/Mounds Rd. and E. 32nd Street.** This segment of SR 9 lies between SR 232/Mounds Road and I-69 Interchange Exit #26 with a dual CSX railroad track averaging 30-40 trains per day. SR 9 is a major 4-lane arterial with daily traffic ranges from 34,000 to 36,500 for a 24-hour period. As trains enter and exit the South Anderson Train Facility, traffic on SR 9 becomes stagnant for extended periods several times each day. It is recommended that a **feasibility study and construction of a railroad grade separation** be scheduled at this critical road segment.

4. **SR 13, Between SR 38 and Madison/Hancock Line.** This segment of the SR 13 project is located in the southwest quadrant of Madison County and includes Interstate 69 Interchange Exit # 14. It serves as a minor arterial linking Fortville at SR 67, Lapel at SR 32, and SR 38 near Pendleton. Several proposed developments on SR 13 and the expanding residential developments on SR 38 will create the demand for additional highway capacity. **Added travel lanes** are recommended between SR 38 and the Madison/Hancock County line.

5. **SR 28, Between SR 37 and Madison/Tipton Line.** This SR 28 segment is located within the Elwood corporate limits and ranges from 9,2000 to 10,400 vehicles per day. SR 28 serves as a vital connection for Tipton, Alexandria, and the Interstate 69 Interchange Exit # 45. This state project is scheduled for **road reconstruction, curb, gutter, and sidewalks.**

6. **SR 32, Between Raible Avenue and Park Road.** State Road 32 West links Edgewood with Anderson and serves as the western gateway into the Anderson business district. This segment has a

Thoroughfare Map

2025 Long Range Transportation Plan Project Descriptions (continued)

mix of commercial/retail and residential development. The ADT averages 12,000 vehicles per day with a significant pedestrian usage along this thoroughfare. **Added travel lanes and sidewalks for SR 32 West** is recommended for Years 2006-2015.

7. **SR 32, Between CR 400 W. and Madison/Hamilton County Line.** The SR 32 segment from Anderson to Noblesville ranges between 6,800 and 7,300 vehicles per day. This segment serves as a vital journey-to-work link for both Madison and Hamilton County residents and will continue to be an essential connection for the Anderson and Noblesville urbanized areas. **Road reconstruction** is recommended for the 2016-2025 construction period.

8. **SR 37, Between CR 400 N. and SR 28.** The State Road 37 corridor from 191st Street to SR 9 North Junction in Marion is currently being studied for added travel lanes. This corridor ranges between 8,500 and 10,500 vehicles per day with a 6-8% heavy-truck classification. The continuous development on this multi-county state route will greatly contribute to the influx of commuting passenger cars and heavy-truck traffic. **Added travel lanes** are recommended for the entire length of the portion of SR 37 that travels through Madison County.

9. **SR 37, Between SR 28 and CR 1900 N.** This segment of SR 37 is a continuation of the SR 37 corridor feasibility. **Added travel lanes** are recommended for the remaining portion of the corridor that travels through Madison County.

10. **SR 38, Between I-69 and Hamilton County Line.** This 4.5 mile segment of SR 38 extends west from Interstate 69 Interchange Exit 19 to the Madison/Hamilton County line. Traffic volumes range from 5,200 to 6,500 vehicles per day with a 5-6% heavy-truck classification. Commercial and residential development on this corridor will continue to increase future travel demand for the next 10-15 years. **Road reconstruction** is recommended for the portion of SR 38 that travels through Madison County.

11. **SR 38, Between I-69 and SR 9/67.** The SR38 Pendleton By-pass project has been segmented into three (3) phases: 1.) Enterprise Drive/Pendleton Industrial Park south of SR38; 2.) By-pass from SR 38 to Old SR 132; 3.) By-pass from Old SR 132 to SR9/67. The **Pendleton By-pass** project is an effort to preserve the Pendleton Historic District as well as encouraging economic growth and development.

12. **SR 67, Between I-69 and Madison/Hancock Line.** SR 67 South is a major arterial extending from I-69 Interchange Exit # 22 to Marion County via Fortville and McCordsville in Hancock County. Road reconstruction for the southern portion of the corridor has been scheduled for 2004 and the remaining **road reconstruction** will be scheduled during the 2006-2015 project timetable.

13. **I-69, Exit # 34 Interchange at SR 67.** The I-69 Interchange Exit # 34 at Daleville has experienced the highest growth of interstate heavy-truck traffic of all the interchanges within the metropolitan planning study area. The average daily traffic ranges from 22,000 to 25,000 vehicles per day on SR 67 and 38,000 to 40,000 vehicles per day on I-69. Vehicle classifications for commercial and heavy truck volumes range between 22% and 27%. This interchange encompasses the Burlington Trucking terminal, (3) semi-truck service plazas, the Daleville Outlet Mall, Trader's Village Market Place, and several retail/service businesses. As the commercial and heavy truck volumes continue to increase, **an interchange modification** is recommended for the 2016-2025 project timetable.

14. **SR 128, Between CR 600 W. and CR 500 W.** This one mile road segment of SR 128 extends through the Frankton Town Limits. The average daily traffic ranges from 7,200 to 7,800 vehicles per day. **Curbs, gutters, and sidewalks** are recommended for the 2006-2015 project timetable.

15. **Rangeline Road/CR 200 E, Between SR 236 and CR 400 S.** The Rangeline Road corridor connects the northeast urban boundary with CR 400 S. The SR 236 and CR 200 E. intersection is scheduled for improvement in 2001. The CR 200 E. bridge over I-69 is scheduled for reconstruction in 2006. Due to the increased north/south traffic volumes, the **intersection at CR 200 E. and CR 400 S. will need to be reconstructed**.

16. **CR 800 N, Between SR 9 and CR 500 E.** Madison County Road 800 North is a minor arterial extending between SR 9 and Interstate 69 Interchange Exit # 41. CR 800 North continues east into Delaware County and becomes SR 332 at the I-69 interchange. The average daily traffic ranges between 7,000 and 7,500 vehicles per day with a heavy truck classification of 6-8%. This county road segment exhibits many of the characteristics of most state routes and **road reconstruction** of CR 800 North is recommended for the 2000-2006 project timetable.

17. **E. 8th Street, Between Fremont Street and Rangeline Road.** The E. 8th segment from SR 9 to Rangeline Road serves as a minor arterial. The ADT for this predominately residential segment averages between 4,000 to 5,000 vehicles per day. The sidewalk system for E. 8th Street terminates at Fremont Street and forces the pedestrian/bikeway activity into a congested area from Nursery Road to SR 9. **A sidewalk and bikeway improvement project is recommended for 2006 through 2015.**

18. **W. 8th Street, Between Raible Avenue and Park Road.** The W. 8th Street segment from Raible Avenue to Park Road functions as a minor arterial for Anderson, Edgewood, and Madison County through traffic. This W. 8th Street link averages between 6,000 and 7,000 vehicles per day for this primarily residential and recreational area. **A sidewalk and bikeway improvement project is recommended for 2005.**

19. **E. 10th Street, Between Central Avenue and SR 9.** This minor arterial averages from 5,000 to 6,000 vehicles per day. Edgewater Park, Anderson University, and the Park Place neighborhoods utilize this roadway link from the Anderson Central Business District to the State Road 9/Scatterfield Road business area. Due to the heavy pedestrian and bicycle usage from the residential density and university activity, a **sidewalk and bikeway improvement project is recommended for 2006-2015.**

20. **E. 38th Street, Between SR 9 and Rangeline Road.** This minor arterial averages between 9,000 to 10,000 vehicles per day. Hoosier Park, Delphi Plant 20, Scatterfield commercial activity, and Old SR 67 commuter traffic comprise the majority of vehicle trips on E. 38th Street. The current two-lane link will experience approximately 20% traffic growth in the next 10 years as the commercial activity continues to evolve along SR 9/Scatterfield Road. **Added travel lanes are recommended for 2000-2005.**

21. **E. 53rd Street, Between Columbus Avenue and Pendleton Avenue.** This 2.7 mile primary arterial link averages between 12,000 to 16,000 vehicles per day. The existing two-lane segment provides linkages to Interstate 69, Scatterfield Road commercial area, and various residential neighborhoods. As the demand for additional trips on the E. 53rd Street corridor continues to increase, **added travel lanes are recommended for 2006-2015.**

22. **E. 53rd Street, Between Pendleton Avenue and Park Road.** This minor arterial segment averages between 4,000 and 5,000 vehicles per day. Edgewood, Lapel, and various residential subdivisions

comprise the daily trips on this one-mile link to the 53rd St./Scatterfield Road commercial area. The demand for vehicular trips on 53rd Street will continue to increase as the residential, commercial, and industrial growth develops within the one-mile radius of the Interstate 69 Exit #22 at Pendleton Avenue. **Reconstruction and lane-widening is recommended for 2016-2025.**

23. **60th Street, Between Columbus Avenue and Pendleton Avenue.** The 60th Street extension project is intended to serve as a frontage road between Exit #22 at Pendleton Avenue and Exit #26 of Interstate 69. The first segment of 60th Street between Scatterfield Road and Columbus Avenue was completed in 1995. Projected traffic volume upon completion of the 3.75 mile roadway segment is 5,000 to 6,000 vehicles per day. **New road construction of a two-lane roadway link of minor arterial/collector functional classification is recommended for 2000-2005.**

24. **Alexandria Pike, Between Grand Avenue and Cross Street.** This minor arterial segment averages between 4,000 and 5,000 vehicles per day and serves as a viable link to the Central Business District. Traffic generated along this thoroughfare includes Shady side Lakes Recreation Area, State Road 9, Cross Street Shopping Plaza, Highland High School. Due to the recreational and residential density along Alexandria Pike, **a sidewalk improvement project is recommended for 2000-20005.**

25. **Columbus Avenue, Between 53rd Street and 60th Street.** This minor arterial averages between 7,000 and 8,000 vehicles per day and is a segment of the former State Road 109. Traffic demand for this roadway link continues to grow as the mix of commercial/retail/residential usage continues to develop on the southeast area of Interstate 69. **A lane-widening improvement project is recommended for 2006-2015.**

26. **Cross Street, Between Madison Avenue and Raible Avenue.** This minor arterial averages between 7,000 and 8,000 vehicles per day and serves as a continuous link for the east/west through traffic. Cross Street is a critical link to Raible, Madison, Broadway, Scatterfield, and Rangeline Road. As residential and commercial development continues to grow, **a road reconstruction and sidewalk project is recommended for 2006-2015.**

27. **Cross Street, Between SR 9 and Rangeline Road.** This minor arterial averages between 7,000 and 8,000 vehicles per day. The Cross Street segment is a vital continuation of the east/west beltway link for through traffic. **A road and sidewalk improvement project is recommended for 2006-2015.**

28. **Hartman Road, Between Broadway and Madison Avenue.** This roadway segment is classified as a collector and averages between 6,000 and 7,000 vehicles per day. Traffic along this link is generated from SR 9 North, Broadway, and Alexandria Pike. As the northern portion of Anderson's business area develops, this segment will experience an increased vehicle travel demand. **A road reconstruction project is recommended for 2016-2025.**

29. **Lindbergh Road, Between Alexandria Pike and Rangeline Road.** This collector averages between 4,000 to 5,000 vehicles per day. The continued growth of Anderson University and the Shady side Lakes Recreational Area creates the need for pedestrian and recreational accessibility on the thoroughfare. **A sidewalk improvement project is recommended for 2006-2015.**

30. **Madison Avenue, Between 53rd Street and Anderson Corp. Limits.** This principal arterial averages between 7,000 and 8,000 vehicles per day. Madison Avenue serves as a vital link between southern Madison County and Anderson. The residential and commercial development during the past ten years indicates that this roadway segment will continue to exhibit an increased travel demand. **A resurfacing project is recommended for 2000-2005.**

31. **Madison Avenue, Between Van Buskirk Road and Cross Street.** This principal arterial averages between 11,000 and 12,000 vehicles per day. The residential activity of Deer Creek, Sagamore, Van buskirk Heights, and the Community Hospital Expansion developments reflect the need for improved capacity on North Madison Avenue. **A lane-widening and sidewalks project is recommended for 2016-2025.**

32. **Main Street, Between 38th Street and 53rd Street.** This principal arterial averages between 11,000 and 12,000 vehicles per day. The commercial and residential activity on the southeast sections of Anderson has necessitated the need for expanded capacity for this segment. **Added travel lanes are recommended for 2000-2005.**

33. **Pendleton Avenue, Between I-69 and W. 25th Street.** This principal arterial averages between 14,000 and 15,000 vehicles per day. Pendleton Avenue is a primary gateway into Anderson and serves as a vital link between Interstate 69, the 53rd Street Corridor, and the Central Business District. **A road reconstruction project is scheduled for 2000-2005.**

34. **Raible Avenue, Between 29th Street and 38th Street.** This principal arterial averages between 14,000 and 15,000 vehicles per day. Raible Avenue is a primary north/south thoroughfare that links northern Madison County to the Interstate 69 Exit #22 at Pendleton Avenue. Residential and commercial activity in the northwest section of Anderson will continue to create future demand on the roadway segment. **Added travel lanes are recommended for 2006-2015.**

35. **Raible Avenue, Between North Shore Drive and Cross Street.** This principal arterial averages between 8,000 and 9,000 vehicles per day. The construction of the Raible Avenue Bridge and lane widening between 16th Street and North Shore Drive were the primary phases of this corridor project. The residential and commercial developments in the Community Hospital area and the increased north/south county trips have demonstrated a need for expanded roadway capacity. **Added travel lanes are recommended for 2006-2015.**

36. **South "B" Street, Elwood, Between SR 13/Anderson Street and 18th Street.** This street segment is scheduled to be constructed in conjunction with the construction of the Elwood Municipal Center in 2001. The South "B" Street **road construction** project will enhance the accessibility from Anderson Street/SR 13 and from 18th St. to the new municipal building.

37. **Washington Street, Alexandria, Between SR 9 and CR 100 W/Madison Avenue.** This one-mile road segment is the continuation of Madison County Road 1100 North and becomes Washington Street at the West corporate limits of Alexandria. Average daily traffic ranges between 3,500 and 4,200 vehicles per day. **Road reconstruction** is recommended for the 2006-2015 project timetable.

Conclusion

The intertwined relationship between transportation and land use has impacted, and will continue to impact, the development of the existing county transportation system. As transportation planning increasingly becomes a regional issue, the transportation system must be considered from a perspective that looks beyond simple jurisdictional boundaries. During the public participation process, the public expressed concerns that related to preserving the rural character of the county, as well as promoting orderly development of land. As this process continued, it became apparent that many individuals were in favor of a development environment that was more conducive to a greater variety of mobility options. With this in mind, this chapter has provided goals, objectives, and strategies that promote the ability of people (regardless of age and status) to reach their desired destinations by way of a variety of transportation options.