



## 5.0 PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

Based on the findings of this study, the following preliminary alternatives are being eliminated from further study for the following reasons:

### **Travel Demand Management (TDM) Alternatives**

This alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project.

### **Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternatives**

This alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project.

### **Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Applications**

This alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project.

### **Mass Transit Alternative**

This alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project.

### **Rural Arterial (Non-Freeway) Alternatives**

This alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project.

### **Option 1 for Alternatives B – F**

Given the higher residential, farm, and business relocations, impacts to potential historic sites, and higher overall cost, Option 1 is not recommended to be advanced for further study. For Alternatives B – F, discussed in the previous sections, only Option 2 was used in the Phase 2 screening of each alternative advanced.

### **Alternatives A, B, H, I, K**

These alternatives do not meet the purpose and need of the project.

### **Alternative D**

Alternative D did fulfill the goals of the *Draft Purpose and Need*. Alternative D crosses through the large Whispering Hills subdivision resulting in a high number of residential relocations and neighborhood impacts. This subdivision would be virtually eliminated by this alternative. Alternative D connects to existing US 31 approximately 1/3 of a mile south of the existing US 20 interchange. The close proximity of this connection to the existing interchange creates insufficient distance to accommodate the proper weaving movements for the traffic flow. Due to the insufficient geometrics and the relocations and neighborhood impacts, this alternative was eliminated from further consideration.



**Alternative J**

Alternative J used the largest percentage of the existing US 31 right-of-way. This alternative was one of the best performers in regards to the Purpose and Need measures. Generally, the more an alternative utilized portions of existing US 31, the better it performed. Alternative J also generally had the lowest impacts to the natural environment, as less new right-of-way would be required. However, this alternative also had the highest residential relocations among the alternatives and the highest cost. Alternative J would require 235 residence and 86 business relocations. In addition, it would significantly impact two closely situated Local Historical Landmarks along existing US 31, the Ullery/Farneman House, an Italianate-style house (c. 1860), and the Southlawn Cemetery (including the small caretaker's building). Alternative J is adjacent to both the Newton Park in Lakeville and the LaVille Jr.-Sr. High School. Shifting Alternative J to the west to avoid the park and school would make it essentially the same as Alternatives B, C, D, E and F of which Alternatives C, E, and F have been carried forward for further analysis. Alternative J, although a high performer in regard to Purpose and Need, was eliminated due to the high relocations, significant impacts to Local Historic Landmarks, impacts to Newton Park and the LaVille Jr.-Sr. High School and high cost.

Figure 5.1 shows the freeway alternatives eliminated from further consideration.

