



FEBRUARY 25, 2010 PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY

SOUTHERN EXTENSION OF US 45 BYPASS, JACKSON, MADISON COUNTY, TN

PIN: 109926.00

The City of Jackson conducted a public meeting for the above-listed project on Thursday, February 25, 2010, from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. at the South Jackson Community Center. There were 213 public attendees. Other attendees included representatives from the City of Jackson; Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT); Gresham, Smith and Partners (GS&P), planning and design consultant to the city; Younger Associates, public involvement consultants to the city, the County Mayor and State Senator Lowe Finney. The sign in sheets are attached.

The meeting handout included:

- Description of the NEPA Process;
- Project description;
- Depiction and description of preliminary Study Corridor build options and the No-Build option;
- Preliminary project need and purpose; and
- Potential environmental impacts.



Displays placed in the meeting room depicted a Project Area Map, a map with previously studied alternatives and a map depicting the three Corridor Options currently being studied. (There was also a dot board where attendees could rank their top three needs for the project. However, there was not enough participation in the dot board to get a valid statistical response from those attending.)

After welcoming statements by Keith Donaldson, principal planner with the City of Jackson and MPO coordinator; County Mayor Jimmy Harris, and State Senator Lowe Finney, a brief presentation highlighted the study history, purpose and need and the three proposed study corridor options. A question and answer session followed. A court reporter was present to record the meeting discussion and to take verbal comments from attendees. Before and after the presentation, City of Jackson, GS&P, and TDOT staff members were all present to answer questions at the displays and to provide information.



The majority of the comments from the question and answer portion of the evening related to:

Public Meeting Summary
 Southern Extension of US 45 Bypass
 Page 2

- Concerns about annexation/development along the bypass extension;
- Why is a third (new) crossing not being considered;
- Impacts of the new bypass on homes and property values;
- Concerns about the location of the bypass' southern termini;
- Relationship of the southern termini and SR 18; and
- Impacts to the wetlands, streams, and historical sites.

Comment cards were provided to the attendees. Summaries of the responses are listed in Tables 1, 2, and 3. A summary of all written comments with responses is attached.

The official record for the public meeting includes a total of 31 comments. Thirty comments were received via the comment cards, which were turned in at the meeting or returned by mail. One verbal comment was made to the court reporter.

The comments reveal general support for the proposed project with 27 of the 31 comments responding “Yes” to the question – “Do you think this project is needed?” Traffic congestion and emergency vehicle response access were the most frequently listed reasons for project support. The most frequently cited concern among the comments was in regard to the impact to existing residences and businesses.



Of the Corridor Options commented on, Corridor C was the most favored. A general consensus among all attendees who submitted comments was that the project’s completion cannot happen soon enough.

Table 1: What do you see as the need for this project? (check all that apply)

| Need | Number of attendees who selected this need |
|---|--|
| A. Need for improved crossings of the South Fork of the Forked Deer River | 17 |
| B. Need to address safety issues along the existing roadway | 14 |
| C. Need to better accommodate existing and projected traffic | 25 |
| D. Growth and economic development | 17 |
| Other(s) – please describe. | See Attached |

**Table 2: What issues and concerns do you have about the project?
 (check all that apply)**

| Issues and Concerns | Number of attendees who selected this issue or concern |
|--|--|
| A. Impacts to the environment (streams, wetlands, sensitive species, recreation) | 6 |
| B. Impacts to existing development (homes, businesses, community facilities) | 17 |
| C. Air and noise impacts | 5 |
| D. Impacts to historic and/or archaeological resources | 6 |
| Other(s) – please describe. | See Attached |

Table 3: Do you think this project is needed?

| Is this project needed: | Number of attendees who selected “yes” or “no” |
|-------------------------|--|
| A. Yes | 27 |
| B. No | 4 |
| Comments | See Attached |

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m. by Keith Donaldson, City of Jackson.

Prepared by: Sandy Layne-Sclafani and Margaret Slater, GS&P

SUMMARY AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM FEBRUARY 25, 2010 PUBLIC MEETING, SOUTHERN EXTENSION OF US 45 BYPASS, JACKSON, TN

| COMMENT RESPONSE 1. NEED FOR THIS PROJECT | 1. NEED FOR THIS PROJECT | | | | | RESPONSE | 2. ISSUES AND CONCERNS | | | | | RESPONSE | 3. IS PROJECT NEEDED? | | | RESPONSE | ADDITIONAL COMMENTS | RESPONSE | |
|--|----------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-------|---|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-------|--|---|----|-------|---|---|---|---|
| | Improved Crossing of SFFDR | Safety | Existing and Projected Traffic | Growth and Economic Dev. | Other | | Impacts to the Environment | Impacts to Existing Development | Air and Noise Impacts | Impacts to Cultural Resources | Other | | Yes | No | OTHER | | | | |
| 1 | X | X | X | X | | Keep it a bypass. Do not allow commercial businesses. | Access will be limited, which will restrict commercial and residential development. | X | | | | There are many springs and farmland in the Bemis that the road will cross. Do not destroy the source of Cane Creek in Bemis. | Environmental impacts will be determined during the next project phase when an ecological study is conducted. | X | | How will the Bypass affect the wetlands, Cane Creek, Indian artifacts, Boone Lane and the Bemis Intermediate School? | Project effects will be determined during the next project phase. | | |
| 2 | | | | | | We do not need this at this time. | A No-Build alternative is being considered. | | | | | | | X | | Absolutely not - NO | A No-Build alternative is being considered. | | |
| 3 | X | | X | | | | | X | X | X | X | | | X | | A better route to Jackson is needed but wants to know why the east side of town couldn't be used for an east bypass. | This study is for a north/south bypass. | | |
| 4 | | | X | | | If there is an emergency anywhere south of Jackson, and traffic is tied up on 45 with a wreck, there is no way for medical personnel to get through. | Planners are aware of emergency access issues to south Jackson--project solutions will address this need | | | | X | Traffic congestion on the south end of the proposed ramp onto 45S (S Highland). It needs to be further outside of town. | The location of the southern termini is still being studied. | X | | It is overdue. | No response needed. | The faster it can be done the better. | No response needed. |
| 5 | X | X | X | X | | The bypass needs to come out south of Wal-Mart. US 45 is already heavy in traffic. | The location of the southern termini is still being studied. | | | | X | Understands that impacts are a necessary part of growth. We need the bypass. | No response needed. | X | | Traffic is bad from Wal-Mart south into Jackson. | Traffic issues are being considered as part of this study. | We need something to redirect traffic on 45. | The Corridor C Alternative provides a route to redirect through traffic. |
| 6 | X | X | X | | | | | | | | X | Preservation of the Community in Bemis and Malesus | Historic Bemis will be preserved, Malesus is south of the US 45 study area. | X | | The lack of crossings has slowed down the development south of Jackson. | No response needed. | Get the work done as soon as possible. | No response needed. |
| 7 | X | | X | | | Supports the construction of a new southern bypass along the existing Riverside Drive. | No response needed. | | | | | | | X | | | | Riverside Drive is the better of the two options. | No response needed. |
| 8 | X | X | X | X | | Following the 1999 tornado, traffic in the vicinity of Caldwell Road and Riverside Drive was bumper to bumper--these roads were not equipped to handle the traffic. The project is definitely needed. | No response needed. | X | | | X | Request preservation of such sites as Sadie Lou Corner at Riverside Drive and Steam Mill Ferry Road, Cane Creek Cemetery, Churches in the Cane Creek Road area, and Raines Spring. | This project will comply with all state and federal requirements for historic preservation and will strive to avoid impacts to historic properties. | X | | We definitely need to improve access from south of the S Fork of the Forked Deer River into Jackson. Would like to see a new crossing, but know environmental concerns prohibit it. | No response needed. | Adopt the Corridor C Alternative with care and concern for the history of southwest Madison County. Would prefer to see terminus at the junction of the improved SR 18 rather than US 45. | This project will comply with all state and federal requirements for historic and ecological preservation. The location of the southern termini is still being studied. |

SUMMARY AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM FEBRUARY 25, 2010 PUBLIC MEETING, SOUTHERN EXTENSION OF US 45 BYPASS, JACKSON, TN

| ID | COMMENT RESPONSE | | | | | RESPONSE | 2. ISSUES AND CONCERNS | | | | | RESPONSE | 3. IS PROJECT NEEDED? | | | RESPONSE | ADDITIONAL COMMENTS | RESPONSE | |
|----|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|-------|---|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|--|-------|--|---|--|--|---|
| | 1. NEED FOR THIS PROJECT | Improved Crossing of SFFDR | Safety | Existing and Projected Traffic | Other | | Impacts to the Environment | Impacts to Existing Development | Air and Noise Impacts | Other | Yes | | No | OTHER | | | | | |
| 9 | X | X | X | | | | X | | | Detours. Area where bypass ends. | <i>The location of the southern termini is still being studied.</i> | X | | | Way, way overdue! Jackson needs to compete with other cities our size. | <i>No response needed.</i> | The bypass needs to extend further south. Perhaps closer to Pinson. Current route will cause traffic problems. | <i>The location of the southern termini is still being studied.</i> | |
| 10 | X | | | X | X | Avoid present congested areas. Need third river crossing west of Riverside Drive. Join US 45 at Pinson not Bonwood. | <i>Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) will not approve an additional crossing of the SFFDR for this bypass. Pinson is outside the limits of the study area.</i> | | | The wetlands are given priority over people with real needs. | <i>State and Federal government mandate requirements to follow for every project that will impact wetlands. These requirements are being followed for this project.</i> | X | | | Consider a sweeping arc from Bemis Cemetery Rd to Marigold/Walinton Rd to avoid highway business and join SR 18 interchange. | <i>The selected alternate and termini if a build alternative is selected, will be determined in a future project phase.</i> | The EPA is holding up progress. The Sierra Club does NOT represent Madison County. Take west side of Riverside Dr starting at Airways w/o double curve. Near D St switch to east side of Riverside Dr. Proceed to Cane Creek Road but make a sweeping arc ending at Watlington Rd. | <i>The selected alternate will be determined during a future project phase.</i> | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | X | | The bypass proposed needs to cross SR 18 and then connect to US 45 two miles outside city limits, then 4-lane | <i>The chosen alternate and termini will be determined in a future project phase.</i> | SR 18 doesn't need to come out on US 45 bypass. Traffic needs to be diverted. | <i>Determining the location of SR 18 termini is not part of this project.</i> |
| 12 | | | | X | | Need to enter the road 3 miles past Wal-Mart. | <i>The location of the southern termini is still being studied.</i> | | | X | Air and noise (resulting from the project) will not hurt anybody. | <i>No response needed.</i> | X | | | | Recommend Corridor C, Airways Blvd to Riverside Dr to Severs Rd where thru traffic starts to back up. | <i>No response needed.</i> | |
| 13 | X | X | X | X | | Better traffic flow. | <i>The Corridor C Alternative will improve traffic flow by taking the heavy truck traffic off of US 45.</i> | X | X | X | X | Taking traffic off US 45. Fewer traffic lights. 55 or 65 mph. | <i>A study will be done to determine if there will be any traffic signals on the new bypass if Corridor C is selected. Grade separations could eliminate the need for signals along most or all of the project route</i> | X | | | | Why not put SR 223, to the North and South to come out at 3-way to the north and US 45 south to come out on the south end. This would take a lot of traffic from area of Sam's and Wal-Mart. | <i>SR 223 is located too far west to meet the project purpose and need.</i> |

SUMMARY AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM FEBRUARY 25, 2010 PUBLIC MEETING, SOUTHERN EXTENSION OF US 45 BYPASS, JACKSON, TN

| COMMENT NUMBER | 1. NEED FOR THIS PROJECT | | | | | RESPONSE | 2. ISSUES AND CONCERNS | | | | | RESPONSE | 3. IS PROJECT NEEDED? | | | RESPONSE | ADDITIONAL COMMENTS | RESPONSE | | |
|----------------|----------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-------|---|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-------|--|---|----|-------|----------|--|---|--|---|
| | Improved Crossing of SFFDR | Safety | Existing and Projected Traffic | Growth and Economic Dev. | Other | | Impacts to the Environment | Impacts to Existing Development | Air and Noise Impacts | Impacts to Cultural Resources | Other | | Yes | No | OTHER | | | | | |
| 14 | | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | Traffic lights on 45 (proposed bypass) will back up traffic. Provided drawing showing no control lights, interchange instead. | <i>A study will be done to determine if there will be any traffic signals on the new bypass if Corridor C is selected. Grade separations could eliminate the need for signals along most or all of the project route</i> | |
| 15 | | | | | | | | X | X | X | X | Concerned with impacts to privacy of area residents; that the city will try to annex land; that crime rate will increase from more people being in the area and having easier get-aways. | <i>A No-Build alternative is being considered. If a build alternative is selected, all efforts will be made to minimize impacts to property owners in the project area.</i> | | X | | Instead of building new roads, easier methods should be tried first to improve emergency response such as marking fire lanes/emergency lanes or issuing fines to vehicles that don't get over. | <i>The project team has interviewed emergency service providers, who feel that a second crossing that is up to current roadway standards is needed. Roadway blockages on US 45 have occurred and are a major concern.</i> | Jackson has too many large roads for a city so small. Increases pollution and forces people to drive. This road crosses private land (including fragile, protected wetlands), and encroaches on many historic areas. | <i>Jackson has numerous roads, but studies have proven that there are insufficient routes to South Jackson. If a build alternative is selected, all efforts will be made to either minimize or avoid impacts to natural and cultural resources.</i> |
| 16 | | | X | X | | The single greatest need is for an additional set of bridges over the Forked Deer River and another four lane highway to South Jackson. | Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) will not approve an additional crossing of the SFFDR for this bypass. | | | | | Concern is that planners will settle for just improving existing highway and bridges. A disaster on either existing bridge severs almost all north/south traffic. | <i>Improvement of Riverside Drive will increase capacity in the area by adding an additional northbound and southbound lane.</i> | | X | | | | Major work on the existing 45 will bottleneck traffic and hurt businesses that depend on customers from south of the Forked Deer. | <i>If the Riverside Drive Alternate is selected, existing US 45/South Highland Avenue will remain in its current state. The only impact will occur when and where the bypass is connected to US 45.</i> |
| 17 | X | X | X | | | Get the 18-wheelers off the heavily traveled areas of 45 south between Jackson and counties south of Madison County | <i>The Corridor C Alternative provides an alternate route for these heavy trucks.</i> | | | X | | I am concerned that the proposed bypass will not be a true bypass if it ties into 45 South in the Bonwood Community. | <i>Your concern is noted. A connection to existing US 45/S. Highland farther south will be studied</i> | | X | | This should have been done more that 30 years ago. | <i>No response needed.</i> | This project is necessary, but terminus should be shifted farther south of the Bonwood area. | <i>The location of the southern termini is still being studied.</i> |
| 18 | | | X | X | | | | | | X | | | | | X | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| 20 | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | |

SUMMARY AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM FEBRUARY 25, 2010 PUBLIC MEETING, SOUTHERN EXTENSION OF US 45 BYPASS, JACKSON, TN

| COMMENT NUMBER | COMMENT RESPONSE | | | | | RESPONSE | 2. ISSUES AND CONCERNS | | | | | RESPONSE | 3. IS PROJECT NEEDED? | | | RESPONSE | ADDITIONAL COMMENTS | RESPONSE | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|-------|----------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------|-----|----------|--|---|--|----------|---------------------|---|--|--|----------------------------|--|---|
| | 1. NEED FOR THIS PROJECT | Improved Crossing of SFFDR | Safety | Existing and Projected Traffic | Other | | Impacts to the Environment | Impacts to Existing Development | Air and Noise Impacts | Other | Yes | | No | OTHER | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | Make sure that you have the funds first before you start this project. Do not raise taxes of any kind. | <i>It is anticipated that the work will be done with federal or state funds, with a low percentage local match. Taxes would not be raised for this match.</i> | | | | |
| 22 | | X | X | X | X | | | | | X | | | | | | | | Need to move project as far south as possible to avoid bottleneck at US 45 South in a heavy traffic area. Would be good to connect bypass with SR 18 expansion. Corridor C is best. | <i>Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) will not approve an additional crossing of the South Fork of the Forked Deer. The location of the southern termini is still being studied. Consideration will be given to the connection of US 45 with SR 18 when its location has been determined.</i> | | | | |
| 23 | | | X | X | X | | | | | X | | | Farm property and concerns surrounding the property. | <i>Farm impacts will be determined during the next project phase.</i> | | | | X | | I stay off the bypass as much as possible! I am glad to hear that this will be different. The bypass is dangerous. | <i>No response needed.</i> | | |
| 24 | | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | I trust the professional planners to adequately address these. | <i>No response needed.</i> | | | | X | | Clearly the new west corridor is preferred. | <i>No response needed.</i> | 1. Does not provide another crossing of river. 2. Not true bypass since terminus is in the middle of developed area. 3. Does not indicate any coordination with SR 18 - only 2 intersections are proposed. Would be shocked if Seavers Rd option was not selected for SR 18. What plan integrates with that? | <i>If Corridor C is selected, a greatly improved crossing will result along the Riverside Drive Alignment, a crossing which is currently substandard. The location of the southern termini is still being studied. Consideration will be given to the connection of US 45 with SR 18 when its location has been determined.</i> |

SUMMARY AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM FEBRUARY 25, 2010 PUBLIC MEETING, SOUTHERN EXTENSION OF US 45 BYPASS, JACKSON, TN

| COMMENT RESPONSE 1. NEED FOR THIS PROJECT | Improved Crossing of SFFDR | | | | RESPONSE | 2. ISSUES AND CONCERNS | Impacts to the Environment | | | | RESPONSE | 3. IS PROJECT NEEDED? | | | RESPONSE | ADDITIONAL COMMENTS | RESPONSE |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-------|---|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|-----------------------|-----|---|--|--|---|
| | Safety | Existing and Projected Traffic | Growth and Economic Dev. | Other | | | Impacts to the Environment | Impacts to Existing Development | Air and Noise Impacts | Impacts to Cultural Resources | | Other | Yes | No | | | |
| 25 | X | X | X | | | | | | | Too short sighted. | | X | | | | We need to tie 45, 18, 223 etc. together further west. | SR 223 is too far west to meet the project need. A tie in of SR 18 and the proposed bypass will be studied. |
| 26 | | X | X | X | | | | X | | | | X | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | | | | X | X | X | | | X | Use Option A (No-Build). Proposed \$80 million expenditure could be used for homes, food, insurance for those in need and to educate our kids!! | A No-Build alternative is being considered. In addition, monies that may be used are dedicated for use on transportation projects. | Whoever is protecting the city's interest must be on top of the federal and state rules - TDOT will not give you options of ways to proceed unless you call them on the rules & regulations. | All project activity is being coordinated with TDOT. |
| 28 | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | X | | Past due! | No response needed. | This should have started years ago. | No response needed. |
| 29 | X | | X | | | | | | | Poor location - design needs to be advanced into the future - this proposal has always been inadequate. | Multiple locations within the area have been previously studied and rejected. Project will look at connection further south to US 45. | | X | Need controlled access facility along a north-south corridor with east-west tie ins. | Access will be limited on this roadway. There will be east-west tie-ins on Corridor C, for example at D Street. | I like the old RR solution around Norton Hill. | All railroads in the project corridor along which a road could have been developed are currently active. |
| 30 | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | | | | X | | | | | |
| 31 | | | X | | As part of the NEPA process, emergency responders have been interviewed and invited to attend all project meetings. Their input will be solicited throughout the project. | | | X | | | | | X | Needed to help traffic congestion & emergency situations | The Corridor C Alternative will provide relief from congestion on US-45 and facilitate emergency response. | I personally like Corridor C. I don't think Corridor B will take care of the problem. I totally understand people's frustration but I want to applaud all of your efforts whether it seems like it or not, we really appreciate your work. | No response needed. |