



APPENDIX B: Community Advisory Committee (CAC)/Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting Summaries

Tier 2 Environmental Impact Statement

I-69 Section 6

Martinsville to Indianapolis



Appendix B Table of Contents

CAC NORTH#1 MEETING SUMMARY - JANUARY 29, 20151

CAC SOUTH #1 MEETING SUMMARY - JANUARY 29, 2015.....5

SWG #1 MEETING SUMMARY - JANUARY 29, 20158

CAC NORTH #2 MEETING SUMMARY - MAY 12, 2015..... 11

CAC SOUTH #2 MEETING SUMMARY - MAY 12, 2015..... 14

SWG #2 MEETING SUMMARY - MAY 11, 2015 17

CAC-SWG COMBINED #3 MEETING SUMMARY - JULY 21, 201521

CAC-SWG COMBINED #4 MEETING SUMMARY - NOVEMBER 30, 2015.....29

CAC-SWG COMBINED #5 MEETING SUMMARY - MARCH 29, 201633

CAC-SWG COMBINED #6 MEETING SUMMARY - JUNE 28, 2016.....38

CAC-SWG COMBINED #7 MEETING SUMMARY - SEPTEMBER 27, 201642

CAC-SWG COMBINED #8 MEETING SUMMARY – DECEMBER 12, 201646

CAC-SWG COMBINED #9 MEETING SUMMARY – MARCH 14, 201751

CAC-SWG COMBINED #10 MEETING SUMMARY – JUNE 15, 201755

CAC-SWG COMBINED #11 MEETING SUMMARY – SEPTEMBER 12, 201757



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 6 – CAC North Summary

I-69, Section 6 Community Advisory Committee (CAC) North #1

Meeting Summary

January 29, 2015

CAC Attendees

Name	Title	Representing
Dr. Frank Giles	Associate Superintendent	Perry Township Schools
Dr. William Long	Assistant Superintendent	Center Grove School Corporation
Bill Boyd	Director for Perry Township	MCANA
Travis Underhill	City Engineer	City of Franklin
Shannetta Griffin	Sr. Director of Planning and Development	Indianapolis Airport Authority
Megan Ritter	Director, Public Policy	Indiana Farm Bureau
Christian Maslowski	President	Greater Greenwood Chamber of Commerce
Jason Holiday	City-County Councilor	Marion County
Non-CAC Members		
Sarah Rubin	Project Manager	INDOT
Kevin Hetrick	Project Manager	INDOT
Janice Osadczuk	Team Leader	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	Engineering Manager	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	Project Manager	HNTB
Tim Miller	Dep. Project Manager	Lochmueller Group

I. Presentation and General Discussion:

The meeting began with introductions and a summary of the decision-making process. INDOT presented a PowerPoint presentation that contained the following information:

- o Summary, purpose, protocol, and role of the Stakeholder groups;
- o Update on the status of I-69 between Evansville and Martinsville;
- o Scoping and Project Development Process;
- o Screening Criteria;
- o Public Involvement Activities
- o Project Schedule



At the conclusion of the presentation, participants were asked for general questions and comments.

General Notes

1. CAC members would like a copy of the PowerPoint Presentation presented at each CAC meeting.
2. INDOT will contact CAC members before future meeting dates to determine if there are conflicts with meeting dates.
3. It was suggested that INDOT provide the names of the other two stakeholder groups, south CAC and the Stakeholder Working Group.
4. Consider inviting Mooresville and Decatur Township Schools to the CAC.
5. Meeting summaries should be provided as soon as possible. It will be critical to accurately communicate information to organization members.
6. It was suggested that summaries of the South CAC and the SWG be provided.
7. The CAC is an advisory group.

Questions & Answers

1. Is there a process for determining consensus for CAC members?
Answer – It is not the intent of a CAC to always come to consensus. The purpose of the CAC is to provide feedback and input on the project. INDOT will document CAC member input in the form of meeting summaries. These summaries will be included as an appendix in the Section 6 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). This input, along with a variety of other factors, will determine the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
2. Why are non-SR 37 alternatives being considered? How will a Preferred Alternative be selected?
Answer – The original decision to utilize the existing SR37 was made in 2004. Due to the potential for significant impacts and or changed conditions, INDOT and FHWA may consider alternatives outside the selected corridor.
INDOT will equally consider impacts and benefits of all Alternatives when selecting a preferred alternative. Ultimately FHWA will approve the selection of a Preferred Alternative in concert with INDOT. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will document the reason for the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
3. Was there “buy-in” from community officials on the selected Tier 1 corridor??
Answer - Like many large transportation projects, some supported utilizing the existing SR37 corridor while others had other opinions.
4. Is INDOT determining the route or is there a decision whether I-69 will be constructed?
Answer - INDOT is committed to completing I-69, up to and through construction.

II. CAC Goals and Expectations:



Members of the CAC were asked to provide their goals and expectations of their CAC involvement. The following is a summary of those goals and expectations.

1. Focus more on information gathering than providing feedback.
2. Need to consider business interests along SR 37 who have put expansion plans on hold. The faster INDOT comes to a decision, the faster economic growth can be realized.
3. Timely and accurate information is critical.
4. Farmland is already developed and has a business purpose; it should not be considered “undeveloped land”.
5. Consider effects on separating school districts if a school district is severed by an interstate. School districts continue building new schools and should be taken into consideration when determining where to construct new roads.
6. Represent your organization, but look at regional/state benefits and impacts. Keep a global view as much as you protect your organization’s interest.
7. Ensure all goals and impacts are equally examined.
8. Ensure input provided by CAC members is seriously considered.
9. Safety considerations along SR 37 are important.
10. Provide information on how a Preferred Alternative is selected.
11. Foster an environment for members to freely provide opinions, input and voice concerns.

III. Considerations Outside Tier 1 Corridor:

What goals should INDOT & FHWA consider important for I-69 Section 6? What considerations should INDOT and FHWA take into account when determining if alternatives outside the approved Tier 1 Corridor will be evaluated?

1. Examine what has changed over the last 10 years. INDOT should re-examine original selection in light of what has changed since the Tier 1 corridor was approved. Consider development at the SR 37/Southport Road intersection. Specifically, Southern Dunes development area. An apartment complex with 400 units is currently under construction. A housing development with 200 units on the west side of Wicker Road and SR 37 is now in the planning phase.
2. The SR37/I-465 interchange area may have significant commercial impacts. The connection with I-465 in this interchange area will be very challenging.
3. Legislation that could affect an alternative in Perry Township should be considered.
4. INDOT should recognize it might have similar concerns whether it constructs I-69 on SR 37 or off the existing alignment.
5. INDOT should help CAC members understand development potential of I-69. Specifically, where would access roads be constructed? How much and what



types of businesses might develop along various potential corridors? Existing businesses along SR 37 include technology, services and agriculture industries.

6. Consider construction cost associated with constructing on new alignment verses existing alignment including right of way and utility costs.
7. Embrace the “build it and they will come” mentality. Development will follow I-69, regardless where it is located.
8. Neighborhood impacts should also be considered. Dead-end roads and land-locked parcels will have a negative impact on residents. There are economic impacts to drivers who have to make longer commutes.
9. Public safety impacts should be considered; such as the location of rail road crossings and emergency services.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 6 – CAC South Summary

I-69, Section 6 Community Advisory Committee (CAC) South #1

Meeting Summary

January 29, 2015

CAC Attendees

Name	Title	Representing
Roger Wiltermood	Chief	Martinsville Police Department
Liz Irwin	Director of Advocacy and Government Affairs	Bloomington Chamber of Commerce
Joe Tutterrow	Board President	Morgan County Parks and Recreation
Phil Deckard	Mayor	City of Martinsville
Normal Voyles	Commissioner	Morgan County
Kevin McGinnis	Manager	Town of Bargersville
Michele Moore	Superintendent	Martinsville Consolidated School District
Chelsey Manns	Executive Director	Morgan County Economic Development Corporation
Jamie Thompson-Taylor	Executive Director	Martinsville Chamber of Commerce
Robert Carter	Chief	Martinsville Fire Department
Greg McKelfresh	CEO	South Central Indiana REMC
Kenny Hale	Director of Planning	Morgan County
Non-CAC members		
JR Blondell	Assistant Chief	Martinsville Fire Department
Sarah Rubin	Project Manager	INDOT
Kevin Hetrick	Project Manager	INDOT
Janice Osadcuk	Team Leader	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	Engineering Manager	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	Project Manager	HNTB
Tim Miller	Dep. Project Manager	Lochmueller Group

I. Presentation and General Discussion:

The meeting began with introductions and a summary of the decision-making process. INDOT presented a PowerPoint presentation that contained the following information:

- o Summary, purpose, protocol, and role of the stakeholder groups;
- o Update on the status of I-69 between Evansville and Martinsville;
- o Scoping and Project Development Process;
- o Screening Criteria;

Section 6 – CAC South Summary



- Public Involvement Activities
- Project Schedule

At the conclusion of the presentation, participants were asked for general questions and comments.

General Notes

1. Do not wait for alternatives on paper before providing input. Let your input drive the development of alternatives.
2. Consider creating a portal for CAC members to obtain project information.
3. The CAC is an advisory committee.

Questions and Answers

1. Will the route north of Martinsville change?
Answer – The original decision to utilize the existing SR37 was made in 2004. Due to the potential for significant impacts and or changed conditions, INDOT and FHWA may consider alternatives outside the selected corridor.
2. How do the ideas developed by the CAC balance with Screening Criteria?
Answer – The decision-making process requires consideration of a wide range of impacts and input when selecting a Preferred Alternative. This includes input from the CAC and other public involvement opportunities.
3. Who are the decision makers?
Answer - It's a joint decision making process between INDOT and FHWA.

II. CAC Goals and Expectations:

Members of the CAC were asked to provide their goals and expectations of their CAC involvement. The following is a summary of those goals and expectations:

1. Establish ways to get the latest project information. Make sure CAC members have messaging points to ensure consistent information is shared.
2. Provide timely and accurate information. Notify CAC members prior to sending out Notice of Survey letters.
3. Notify CAC members of major milestones so they can inform their constituents.
4. Public safety concerns are important. Ensure fire/ambulance considerations are noted.
5. Minimize impacts to farming community and floodplains. Consider natural resource impacts.
6. Accessibility, economic development and connection to schools are important.
7. Transparency, share what we know about Section 6. Should lead off most meetings discussing most current information. Have a “recap” from the last meeting.



8. Maintain flexibility throughout the process.
9. Disseminate information more frequently than quarterly. Do not have to meet more often than that, but information should be shared more frequently.
10. Planning cycle is underway. Would like to see someone representing the natural environment and farmland on the CAC.
11. Access and economic development impacts are critical.
12. Educate CAC members on why or why not INDOT/FHWA should consider alternatives outside the Tier 1 corridor.
13. Consideration should be given to CAC input in addition to quantifiable impacts.

III. Considerations Outside Tier 1 Corridor:

What goals should INDOT & FHWA consider important for I-69 Section 6? What considerations should INDOT and FHWA take into account when determining if alternatives outside the approved Tier 1 Corridor will be evaluated?

1. Change in access should be a consideration.
2. Funding concerns: cost of building on new terrain verses existing alignments. Identifying a cost-efficient solution should be a consideration.
3. Consider doing an outer loop. P3 or tolling should be considered.
4. Maximize economic impact for Morgan County and the region. Consider the project's close proximity to Indianapolis and the Indianapolis International Airport with respect to economic development.
5. Local communities have made zoning changes and constructed access roads in order to prepare for I-69 on SR 37. Need to consider local improvements and investments that have been made during the past 10 years into consideration.
6. Review local planning documents when determining the preferred alternative. They contain valuable information about community goals and growth plans.
7. Consideration should be given to moving goods and freight around the country when deciding if alternatives outside the corridor be considered.
8. Legislative and political input should be considered.
9. Recognize the regional nature of I-69. It is not just economic development for Martinsville, Morgan County or Indiana. There are national economic benefits for I-69. Need to ensure that the best alternatives that yield economic benefits be given consideration.
10. Consider impacts and status to SR 37 if I-69 is constructed off existing alignment What improvements will be needed to SR37 if I-69 is located elsewhere
11. Consider impacts on I-465 when I-69 is constructed. Traffic on I-465 will become worse.
12. The most direct route from Martinsville to Indianapolis is SR 37. Often times the most direct route is the best.



I-69, Section 6 Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) #1

Meeting Summary

January 29, 2015

SWG Attendees

Name	Title	Organization
John Ayers	Engineer	Hendricks County
Mike Pelham	Engineer	Johnson County Highway Engineer
Lucas Mastin	Director	Johnson County Highway Depart.
Mark Richards	Engineer	City of Greenwood
Krista Linke	Community Development Director	City of Franklin
Ross Holloway	Engineer	City of Martinsville
Ryan Gallagher	Transit Planner	IndyGo
Anna Gremling	Director	Indianapolis MPO
Non-CAC Members		
Ron West	Commissioner	Johnson County
Sarah Rubin	Project Manager	INDOT
Kevin Hetrick	Project Manager	INDOT
Janice Osadczuk	Team Leader	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	Engineering Manager	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	Project Manager	HNTB
Tim Miller	Dep. Project Manager	Lochmueller Group

I. Presentation and General Discussions:

The meeting began with introductions and a summary of the decision-making process. INDOT presented a PowerPoint presentation that contained the following information:

- o Summary, purpose, protocol, and role of the Stakeholder groups;
- o Update on the status of I-69 between Evansville and Martinsville;
- o Scoping and Project Development Process;
- o Screening Criteria;
- o Public Involvement Activities
- o Project Schedule

At the conclusion of the presentation, participants were asked for general questions and comments.



Questions and Answers

1. Was the decision to go outside the corridor driven by the Major Moves legislation that could affect an alternative in Perry Township?

Answer – No. The original decision to utilize the existing SR37 was made in 2004. Due to the potential for increased impacts and or changed conditions, INDOT and FHWA may consider alternatives outside the selected corridor.

2. Is INDOT’s consideration for going outside the corridor the reason for a Tier 2 document?

Answer - No, each Section of I-69 included Tier 2 studies. The Tier 1 decision was to determine a corridor for I-69 from Evansville to Indianapolis. Each of the five previous sections of I-69 have had a Tier 2 Environmental Impact Statement prepared.

3. Will copies of the presentation be made available to the SWG members?

Answer - Yes.

II. CAC Goals and Expectations:

Members of the SWG were asked to provide their goals and expectations of their SWG involvement. The following is a summary of those goals and expectations.

1. SWG should know what “absolutes” that cannot be impacted. Would like to know if there are any such resources within the project area.
2. Provide accurate, timely information and facilitate open dialog.
3. How will IndyGo routes be impacted? Please address in future meetings.
4. We need to be good stewards of taxpayer dollars.
5. Consider impacts to communities surrounding the SR 37 corridor.
6. Look at the project objectively, while representing your organizations. Should develop metrics to determine if this is being accomplished.
7. Need to look at regional impacts to traffic, environment and air quality.
8. Keep transparency throughout the process.
9. Information sharing is key. Our charge is to take accurate information back to our communities.
10. Take a larger, big picture view of I-69. Examine if the Tier 1 route is still applicable nearly ten years after the decision. Do your due diligence.
11. Hope the Tier 1 decision is confirmed. There are concerns about how Johnson County’s infrastructure can be preserved and improved.
12. Johnson County is committed to the best route for the community.
13. Do not allow political influence determine the selected alternative.
14. Future economic impacts should be considered, not just current impacts.
15. The SWG should be focused on planning and engineering discussions and decisions.



III. Considerations Outside Tier 1 Corridor:

What goals should INDOT & FHWA consider important for I-69 Section 6? What considerations should INDOT and FHWA take into account when determining if alternatives outside the approved Tier 1 Corridor will be evaluated?

1. Shelby and Johnson Counties and the City of Greenwood have made significant investments with the understanding I-69 would be constructed on SR 37. These include the E/W connector, Fairland Rd (I-74) to I-65/Worthsville Road, and other projects.
2. City of Martinsville has also made signification east/west connectivity improvements.
3. Preferred Alternative should have the lowest social impact.
4. INDOT should maximize economic opportunity for I-69.
5. Quality of life and social impacts must be considered when considering looking outside the Tier 1 corridor.
6. Develop pros and cons of following the existing SR37.
7. Need to consider “lessons learned” from Section 5 and other Sections of I-69.
8. Consider time and cost savings of alternatives on and outside the Tier 1 corridor.



MEETING MINUTES

Section 6 Community Advisory Committee (CAC) North #2

Morgan County Division of Family Resources

7851 Waverly Road, Martinsville, IN 46151

May 12, 2015 from 9:00-11:00 a.m. EDT

Attendee	Organization
Pat Andrews	Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations
Bob Babcock	Indiana Rail Road Company
Dr. Little	Perry Township Schools
Shannetta Giffin	Indianapolis Airport Authority
Dr. Frank Giles	Perry Township Schools
Jason Holliday	Marion County
David Holt	Conexus Indiana
Barry Miller	Indiana Motor Truck Association
Dr. William Long	Center Grove School Corporation
Christian Maslowski	Greater Greenwood Chamber of Commerce
Pat Sherman	Johnson County Development Corporation
Mayor Mark Myers	City of Greenwood
Jeremy Pell	White River Township Fire Dept.
Amy Cornell	Indiana Farm Bureau
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Kevin Hetrick	INDOT
LaMar Holliday	INDOT
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	HNTB Corporation
Christine Meador	HNTB Corporation
Tim Miller	Lochmueller Group
Kia Gillette	Lochmueller Group
Eric Swickard	Lochmueller Group

- I. Introductions
 - a. Introduction of Project team
 - b. Introduction of LaMar Holliday, I-69 Public Information Specialist
- II. Old Business – Activities since our last meeting
 - a. Meeting summary from January 29th CAC Meeting
 - i. Section 6 Project Team
 - ii. Section 6 2015 Schedule
 - iii. Tier 1 Selected Corridor and Potential Additional Alternatives
- III. Activities since Last Meeting
 - a. Public Involvement (PIM, Association Meetings, Project Office)
 - b. Field Work



- c. Traffic Data – 2045 Travel Forecasting
 - d. Agency Coordination
- IV. New Business
- a. CAC Chairperson Discussion
 - b. Draft Purpose and Need
 - c. Description of Scoping Process
 - d. Results of Scoping Process
 - e. Conceptual Alternatives
- V. Open Discussion and Questions
- a. How does the number of people asking to look outside the SR 37 corridor compare to what we expected?
 - i. Many in Martinsville have indicated they would like I-69 to stay on SR 37
 - ii. There were no expectations regarding the public comments in the February public meetings.
 - b. What would the interchange be at existing SR 37?
 - i. We have to maintain the Harding Street interchange
 - ii. The potential new system interchange for the SR37 alternative would be approximately 1,000 feet to the west of the existing interchange. (After the meeting, this dimension was checked and found to be approximately 3,000 feet.)
 - c. What are interchange locations along SR 37?
 - i. Interchange locations have not yet been determined.
 - ii. The Tier 1 identified potential interchanges at SR 39, SR 252/44, Egbert Road, SR 144, Smith Valley Road, County Line Road, Southport Road, and I-465.
 - iii. When we get to the point where we identify interchange locations; the CAC, SWG, and the public will be engaged during the identification of potential locations.
 - d. Major destinations on the table are downtown, airport, I-69 on north side of Indianapolis. Is there an assignment of priority?
 - i. No, there is no priority.
 - ii. If there is one that is more important let us know.
 - e. Why were these alternatives eliminated in Tier 1?
 - i. Looked at them as entire corridor alternative from Evansville to Indianapolis.
 - ii. The Tier 1 looked at the alternatives at a macro level. We are now focusing on specifics within Section 6.
 - iii. Mann Road was an alternative previously not recommended for advancement. It was not advanced due to the potential of wetland impacts and compatibility with Marion County Comprehensive Plan.
 - iv. Most of these alternatives were not investigated as part of Tier 1, only Mann Road was investigated.
 - f. With regard to the East Alternatives, why are we concerned about traffic coming to I-65 but not concerned about traffic on I-70?
 - i. I-65 was higher priority as it is already at capacity in the 2045 design year. I-70 could require additional lanes west of SR 267 also but otherwise it has more available capacity.
 - ii. Even if we do not build I-69, I-65 is congested in the 2045 design year.
 - iii. I-70 may require additional lanes if a west alternatives is selected.
 - g. Are we considering having community meetings in Perry Township now that SR 37 is back on table?



- i. We can meet with a group in Perry Township to provide a project update. SR 37 has been on the table since the Tier 1 ROD.
- h. Can we release Google Earth layers for alternatives?
 - i. The Project Team will investigate this possibility.
- i. At what point in time do we consider funding?
 - i. Funding study will be evaluated by INDOT in parallel to the EIS as part of this study.
 - ii. We will know additional information about the funding availability closer to the FEIS/ROD.
 - iii. Financial Plan will be developed in late 2017 between DEIS and FEIS/ROD
- j. Clarification: The outer loop or Commerce Connector as recommended by the Blue Ribbon Panel was a comment that was also raised. We want to be clear that the Commerce Connector is a separate project. We are in a formal EIS process to complete I-69 from Evansville to Indianapolis and the Commerce Connector is not yet at this level of planning. Only projects which are planned and funded are considered in our formal process and traffic models. If the Commerce Connector were to move forward it would have to go through the same environmental process as I-69. The Commerce Connector is not a driver for alternative selection. Governor Pence has stated our goals are to finish what we have started, take care of what we have, and plan for the future. Our goal in this process is to finish I-69.

VI. Information Requested

- a. Low Income/Minority Information
 - i. Need help identifying low income, minority, or special concern populations
 - ii. Areas should include those along alignments but also areas which may be affected by travel times, access to services
 - iii. We need to make sure we are inclusive of everyone
- b. Comments on Purpose & Need
- c. Comments on Conceptual alternatives
- d. General thoughts or comments
- e. Send to us by June 2, 2015 (also deadline for public meetings)

Action Item	Responsible Party	Due Date
Provide links to Purpose and Need, Alternative evaluation when posted to website.	INDOT	May 18, 2015
Provide comments on Purpose and Need and Alternative evaluation	CAC	June 2, 2015
Provide information regarding low income, minority, or special needs populations of concern	CAC	June 2, 2015 or as identified
Google Earth Layers	INDOT	Week of May 18, 2015

Details discussed in this meeting are subject to change. This summary is a reflection of the status of these items at the close of the meeting.

These meeting minutes represent the understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments or revisions to the attention of Christine Meador at cmeador@HNTB.com.

Note: This meeting summary documents ongoing, internal agency deliberations. Accordingly, the information contained in this summary is considered to be pre-decisional and deliberative.



MEETING MINUTES

Section 6 Community Advisory Committee (CAC) South #2

Morgan County Division of Family Resources

7851 Waverly Road, Martinsville, IN 46151

May 12, 2015 from 1:00-3:00 p.m. EDT

Attendee	Organization
Kevin Brinegar	Indiana Chamber of Commerce
Robert Carter	Martinsville Fire Department
Phil Deckard	City of Martinsville
Justin Groenert	Southwest Indiana Chamber
Liz Irwin	Bloomington Chamber of Commerce
Krista Linke	City of Franklin
Chelsey Manns	Morgan County Economic Development Corporation
Kevin McGinnis	Town of Bargersville
Jack Hubbard	South Central Indiana REMC
Michele Moore	Martinsville Consolidated School Corporation
Jamie Thompson- Taylor	Martinsville Chamber of Commerce
Joe Tutterrow	Morgan County Parks and Recreation
Norman Voyles	Morgan County
Rodger Wiltermood	Martinsville Police Department
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Kevin Hetrick	INDOT
LaMar Holliday	INDOT
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	HNTB Corporation
Christine Meador	HNTB Corporation
Tim Miller	Lochmueller Group
Kia Gillette	Lochmueller Group
Eric Swickard	Lochmueller Group

- I. Introductions
 - a. Introduction of Project team
 - b. Introduction of LaMar Holliday, I-69 Public Information Specialist
- II. Old Business – Activities since our last meeting
 - a. Meeting summary from January 29th CAC Meeting
 - i. Section 6 Project Team
 - ii. Section 6 2015 Schedule
 - iii. Tier 1 Selected Corridor and Potential Additional Alternatives
- III. Activities since Last Meeting
 - a. Public Involvement (PIM, Association Meetings, Project Office)
 - b. Field Work



- c. Traffic Data – 2045 Travel Forecasting
- d. Agency Coordination

IV. New Business

- a. CAC Chairperson Discussion
- b. Draft Purpose and Need
- c. Description of Scoping Process
- d. Results of Scoping Process
- e. Conceptual Alternatives

V. Discussion

- a. When will field work be completed?
 - i. Field work on SR 37 began this year and will continue throughout this year. Next year, field work will be conducted on other alternatives as needed.
- b. Does INDOT recognize the financial hardship in the corridor with regards to extending dates of study?
 - i. Reviewed schedule. Identify preferred alternative as part of DEIS.
- c. Focus of study area on four counties. Is there a component of study that will look at connection to I-69 nationally?
 - i. We recognize large scale project and local impacts. INDOT is aware of the status of I-69 throughout the country.
- d. Are there any alternatives that extend the entire way to SR 67 at I-465?
 - i. No, it was determined that a system interchange at that location would conflict with the system interchange at I-70 and I-465 and therefore alternatives which extended to I-465 were not advanced for further consideration.
- e. Would the width in the 400 foot footprint be minimum, maximum, or ideal?
 - i. The 400 foot footprint is our attempt at a reasonable guess with access roads. The footprint will undergo more careful review during the next steps of evaluation.
- f. Would it be possible that both an east and west route could occur?
 - i. No, one alternative will be identified as the preferred alternative and one alternative will be selected.
 - ii. It is important to note that the Purpose and Need and associated performance measures is very important when comparing alternatives.
 - iii. Can't emphasize importance of alternatives meeting the purpose and need enough.
- g. What are the Water of the US signs on Section 5?
 - i. These are areas identified by Army Corps of Engineers as waters of the US (streams or wetlands) which require permitting and have to be protected. These signs will likely be used on Section 6 also.
- h. The CAC suggested it should be made clear that that environmental study includes economic, human environmental, etc. not just natural resources.
- i. Clarification: The outer loop or Commerce Connector as recommended by the Blue Ribbon Panel was a comment that was also raised. The Commerce Connector is a separate project and will have to move through a similar process. If the Commerce Connector were to move forward it would have to go through the same environmental process as I-69. The Commerce Connector is not a driver for alternative selection. Governor Pence has stated our goals are to



finish what we have started, take care of what we have, and plan for the future. Our goal in this process is to finish I-69.

VI. Information Requested

- a. Low Income/Minority Information
 - i. Need help identifying low income, minority, or special concern populations
 - ii. Areas should include those along alignments but also areas which may be affected by travel times, access to services
 - iii. We need to make sure we are inclusive of everyone
- b. Comments on Purpose & Need
- c. Comments on Conceptual alternatives
- d. General thoughts or comments
- e. Send to us by June 2, 2015 (also deadline for public meetings)

Action Item	Responsible Party	Due Date
Provide links to Purpose and Need, Alternative evaluation when posted to website.	INDOT	May 18, 2015
Provide comments on Purpose and Need and Alternative evaluation	CAC	June 2, 2015
Provide information regarding low income, minority, or special needs populations of concern	CAC	June 2, 2015 or as identified

Details discussed in this meeting are subject to change. This summary is a reflection of the status of these items at the close of the meeting.

These meeting minutes represent the understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments or revisions to the attention of Christine Meador at cmeador@HNTB.com.

Note: This meeting summary documents ongoing, internal agency deliberations. Accordingly, the information contained in this summary is considered to be pre-decisional and deliberative.



MEETING MINUTES

Section 6 Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) #2
Morgan County Division of Family Resources
May 11, 2015 from 1:30-3:30 p.m. EDT

Attendee	Organization
Ross Holloway	City of Martinsville
Larry Smith	Morgan County
Michael Pelham	Johnson County
Travis Underhill	City of Franklin
Julie Young	Town of Bargersville
Mark Richards	City of Greenwood
Sean Northrop (for Anna Gremling)	Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization
John Ayres	Hendricks County
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Kevin Hetrick	INDOT
LaMar Holliday	INDOT
Will Wingfield	INDOT
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	HNTB Corporation
Christine Meador	HNTB Corporation
Tim Miller	Lochmueller Group
Kia Gillette	Lochmueller Group

- I. Introductions
 - a. Introduction of Project team
 - b. Introduction of LaMar Holliday, I-69 Public Information Specialist
- II. Old Business – Activities since our last meeting
 - a. Meeting summary from January 29th CAC Meeting
 - i. Section 6 Project Team
 - ii. Section 6 2015 Schedule
 - iii. Tier 1 Selected Corridor and Potential Additional Alternatives
- III. Activities since Last Meeting
 - a. Public Involvement (PIM, Association Meetings, Project Office)
 - b. Field Work
 - c. Traffic Data – 2045 Travel Forecasting
 - d. Agency Coordination
- IV. New Business
 - a. CAC Chairperson Discussion
 - b. Draft Purpose and Need
 - c. Description of Scoping Process
 - d. Results of Scoping Process
 - e. Conceptual Alternatives



V. Discussion

- a. Is the alternative evaluation part of the outer loop evaluation?
 - i. The outer loop, sometimes referred to as the Commerce Connector, is not affiliated with the Section 6 project – when or if it moves forward it would have its own environmental process separate of I-69.
- b. What is the timeline for reduction of alternatives?
 - i. Alternatives will be presented to the resource agencies, SWG, CAC, and public and comments will be accepted. After consideration of comments, alternatives will be further evaluated and screened through the fall. After that alternatives will be brought back to resource agencies, SWG, CAC, and the public.
 - ii. By the fourth quarter we will have reduced number of alternatives to reasonable alternatives that will be studied in the DEIS.
 - iii. Do not have set number of alternatives which will be considered for reasonable alternatives in DEIS. The only alternative assured to move forward in the DEIS is the upgrade of existing SR 37. The Eastern and Western alternatives will be carried forward if they meet the project's Purpose and Need.
 - iv. We intend for this to be an open process with a reduction of alternatives from preliminary to reasonable.
 - v. The draft Purpose & Need with performance measures will be used to screen alternatives.
- c. Is there data to support WHY the public preferred an alternative especially with regards to the bypass around Martinsville?
 - i. No, some people drew this line on the maps at the February PIM's, so INDOT is gathering conceptual information on its impacts and merits
- d. Clarification that SR 37 will be carried forward as a reasonable alternative regardless of other alternatives. It is possible that after screening, SR 37 is the only reasonable alternative. If this were to be the case, there may be some reduction of the schedule.
- e. Does screening and elimination of alternatives affect schedule.
 - i. It is not anticipated unless all alternatives except for SR 37 are screened out.
 - ii. This year's field activities are concentrated on SR 37 because the SR 37 corridor is being carried forward throughout the NEPA process.
 - iii. Next year, alternatives off SR 37 will be evaluated and have field work performed if they are determined to be reasonable.
- f. How confident are you of the Purpose & Need at this time.
 - i. Purpose & Need has been thoroughly reviewed by Project Team.
 - ii. Resource agencies are currently reviewing and will provide comments in early June.
 - iii. Public comment on Purpose & Need is being accepted until June 2. .
 - iv. Comments from this group and the CAC will be accepted until June 2.



- v. Based on Tier 1 goals and includes scoping process that we have gone through this year.
- vi. Performance measures are critical
 - 1. Traffic congestion
 - 2. Travel time
 - 3. Reduction of crashes
- g. What is the assumed LOS and reduction of congestion?
 - i. Measure of improvement, reduction of vehicle number of miles under congestion.
 - ii. I-69 designed at D for urban, C for rural.
- h. Freight – measurement for commerce congestion
 - i. Vehicle miles per hour for freight will be broken out separately
 - ii. Travel time between intermodal facilities as next step
 - iii. Still refining model
- i. Have secondary costs such as widening of interstate been considered.
 - i. Secondary costs will be considered during the next level of screening.
- j. Clarification that all alternatives evaluated have used a 400 foot corridor and these will continue to be refined in order to reduce impacts.
- k. Clarification that the next refinement of alternative evaluation will consider actual road cross sections which in areas of uneven terrain or hills could be wider than 400 feet.
- l. Request for clarification on areas of low income or minority populations to be considered.
 - i. Area to west side of roadway in Martinsville is potential.
 - ii. INDOT wants to identify populations within study area which may be wider than the 400 foot footprint..
 - iii. INDOT will reach out to communities to make sure that we are inclusive of all communities and meet any special needs a community may have with regards to public involvement.

VI. Information Requested

- a. Low Income/Minority Information
 - i. Request assistance in identifying low income, minority, or special concern populations
 - ii. Areas should include those along alternatives but also areas which may be affected by travel times, access to services
 - iii. We need to make sure we are inclusive of everyone
- b. Comments on Purpose & Need
- c. Comments on Conceptual alternatives
- d. General thoughts or comments
- e. Submit comments by June 2, 2015 (also deadline for public meetings)



Action Item	Responsible Party	Due Date
Provide links to Purpose and Need, Alternative evaluation when posted to website.	INDOT	May 18, 2015
Provide comments on Purpose and Need and Alternative evaluation	SWG	June 2, 2015
Provide information regarding low income, minority, or special needs populations of concern	SWG	June 2, 2015 or as identified

Details discussed in this meeting are subject to change. This summary is a reflection of the status of these items at the close of the meeting.

These meeting minutes represent the understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments or revisions to the attention of Christine Meador at cmeador@HNTB.com.

Note: This meeting summary documents ongoing, internal agency deliberations. Accordingly, the information contained in this summary is considered to be pre-decisional and deliberative.



FINAL MEETING MINUTES

Section 6 Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
Stakeholder Working Group #3
 Southland Community Church
 5800 W. Smith Valley Road
 July 21, 2015 from 9:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m. EDT

Attendee	Organization
John Ayres	Hendricks County
Bob Babcock	IN Railroad Company
Lindsey Beckman	Morgan County Economic Development Corporation
Bill Boyd	Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations
Kevin Brinegar	Indiana Chamber of Commerce
Steve Brock	Brown Township Fire Department
Don Colvin	IndyParks
Shannetta Giffin	Indianapolis Airport Authority
Anna Gremling	Indianapolis MPO
Justin Groenert	Southwest IN Chamber of Commerce
Kenny Hale	Morgan County
Jason Holliday	Marion County
David Holt	Conexus Indiana
Barbara Hunt	IN Motor Truck Association
Liz Irwin	Bloomington Chamber of Commerce
Dr. Thomas Little	Perry Township Schools
William Long	Center Grove School Corporation
Christian Maslowski	Greater Greenwood Chamber of Commerce
Kevin McGinnis	Town of Bargersville
Greg McKelfresh	South Central Indiana REMC
Michele Moore	Martinsville Consolidated School Corporation
Rex Morley	Brown Township Fire Department
Cheryl Morphew	Johnson County Development Corporation
Steve Oschman	Greater Mooresville Advisory Committee
Melody Park	Indianapolis DPW
Mike Pelham	Johnson County
Jeremy Pell	White River Township Fire Department
Jeff Quyle	Mooresville/Morgan County
Mark Richards	City of Greenwood
Larry Smith	Morgan County
Jamie Thompson- Taylor	Martinsville Chamber of Commerce
Joe Tutterrow	Morgan County Parks and Recreation
Travis Underhill	City of Franklin
Norman Voyles	Morgan County
Ron West	Johnson County



Rodger Wiltermood	Martinsville Police Department
Julie Young	Town of Bargersville
Ray Young	Town of Brooklyn
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Kevin Hetrick	INDOT
Jim Earl	INDOT
LaMar Holliday	INDOT
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Janice Osadczuk	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	HNTB Corporation
Christine Meador	HNTB Corporation
Ruth Hook	HNTB Corporation
Matt Miller	HNTB Corporation
Lori Miser	HNTB Corporation
Lisa Waller	HNTB Corporation
Tim Miller	Lochmueller Group
Kia Gillette	Lochmueller Group
Eric Swickard	Lochmueller Group

- I. Introductions
 - a. Introduction of CAC and SWG members
 - b. Introduction of Project Team
- II. Activities since Last Meeting
 - a. Public Involvement Meeting
 - b. Field Work
 - c. Preliminary Alternatives Selection Report
 - d. Preliminary Alternatives Press Release
- III. Processes and procedures for today/s combined CAC/SWG meeting
- IV. Discussion- Breakout Sessions
 - a. Alternative C (North Section)
 - i. Access
 - Grade Separation is proposed at Stones Crossing Road rather than Olive Branch Road.
 - Center Grove High School is located along Stones Crossing Road and the main access from the west is Stones Crossing Road.
 - Access road is suggested from SR 144 south to Banta Road along the east side.
 - Additional interchange between SR 144 and Henderson Ford Road.
 - Big Bend Road is preferred location.
 - Could the existing SR 37 and I-465 interchange be used?
 - Look into previous study as to why use of the existing interchange was eliminated. [Note: Existing interchange is proposed to be maintained to keep Harding Street open.]
 - Why placed to the west? There is concern over it being placed to the west, which is an environmentally sensitive area.
 - Could it be placed to the east of the existing interchange?
 - Design of the new I-69 and I-465 interchange



- How will the existing development at SR 37 and I-465 be accessed from the new interchange?
- What is the configuration?
- How will this interchange impact travel along I-465 and what will be done about the increase in traffic?
- Improvements to the SR 37 and I-465 will be necessary to serve the increased truck traffic.
- What will happen to SR 37 where it departs from I-69?
 - Will there be access to I-69?
 - Is there the potential for on and off ramps in order to serve the work force commuting to and from Indianapolis?
- Interchange at Southport Road:
 - Concern over the impacts to existing development at the intersection
 - It will be safer once it becomes an interchange
 - What kind of traffic flow control will there be to ensure safe east/west travel?
- Grade separation at Stop 11 Road
 - Would provide another safe east/west crossing for school buses and parents of school children
- Grade separations will provide better and safer east/west crossing for school buses and parents.
- Concern over access to the mobile home community at Old SR 37 and Stones Crossing Road, on the west side.
- Questions as to the purpose and need of a grade separation at Banta Road
- Sufficient access roads to spur redevelopment where businesses might be lost because of the interstate.
- Maintain easy access to Mallow Run Winery
 - Major tourist destination
 - Main access from Whiteland Road
- Access on the west side of SR 37 from Fairview Road down to Smith Valley Road in order to serve the farm equipment for Indy Family Farms, which farms both sides of the road, and maintain easy access to McCarty Mulch and Stone.
- Bluff Road south from County Line Road to Fairview Road
 - Bluff Road at County Line Road would have to be relocated and reconnected to local roads.
- Concern over SR 144 and Old SR 37:
 - What kind of access will there be to the interchange?
 - Will there be any improvements to the intersection if it is not part of the interchange?
- ii. Infrastructure and Development:
 - Stone Bridge development has been put on hold.
 - Located near Big Bend Road and could serve as a site for an interchange
 - Approximately 100 acres and has potential bat habitat
 - There is the potential for further development on the north side of I-465 at Harding Street.
 - Current development occurring at Thompson Road and SR 37



- Johnson County has been exploring funding for access along the west side of SR 37 in anticipation of I-69 coming through.
 - Would be used for future development including a compressed natural gas (CNG) facility to serve the trucking industry.
- Bargersville working to develop the SR 144 and SR 37 area for new development related to I-69.
- Concerns over impacts to residential and commercial development, both existing and future.
 - Loss of tax revenue from assessed property values (existing commercial)
 - Marion County has water and sewer in the area for new development
 - Future residential development around Southport could lead to a need for more schools and access to students.
 - Southern Dunes is planning another development
- Johnson County East/West Corridor has started with improvements to Whiteland Road and Greenwood's improvements to Worthsville Road
- Some businesses have already begun investigating and buying new property in order to relocate because of I-69.
- Morgan County and Bargersville have plan for wastewater facility near SR 37 and SR 144
- Interceptor sewer being designed at Wicker Road, down the west side of SR 37 to Fairview Road
 - 2018 planned start of construction.
 - 60 inch pipe until Fairview Road where it will then become a 54 inch pipe

iii. Other Comments or Concerns:

- Concerned about construction over gravel pits
- How will SR 37 be maintained if another alternative is selected? Will there be improvements?
- Can there be easements included in right-of-way to allow for biking, walking, and pedestrian paths in order to connect communities?
- Alternative C best fulfills the mission of I-69
- Trucking industry sees Alternative C as the logical route because trucks will have easier access, there is already the existing infrastructure, and the community already accepts trucks.
- General concern over the increase in truck noise

b. Alternative C (South Section)

i. Access:

- Some members suggested grade separations over interstate is preferred
- Consider response times and access from Washington Township fire department on SR44 to Fox Cliff.
- Access to hospital at SR252/SR37 is important
- Access to Wal-Mart shopping center at Grand Valley Road is preferred. Should allow for both pedestrian and vehicular traffic.
- Local access roads from SR 252 to Wal-Mart shopping center alongside interstate for both pedestrian and vehicular traffic should be considered.



- Construct a local access road between SR 44 and SR 252.
 - An interchange at Ohio Street is important in order to serve downtown businesses.
 - The project team should develop a Connectivity Plan for urban Martinsville Area. Plan would show potential access and travel patterns between SR39 and SR252.
 - Consider pedestrian access on grade separations in the Martinsville area
 - An interchange at Henderson Ford Road is preferred over an interchange at Egbert Road because of the existing bridge across White River.
 - A grade separation should be provided at Egbert Road.
 - Much support for the proposed local access road connection between Centennial Road to Henderson Ford Road
 - Consider a roundabout at the Egbert Road and Centennial Road.intersection
 - Consider an interchange at Big Bend Road with local access roads to Perry Road to help growth in TIF areas.
 - Consider response times for Washington Township F.D., which serves Fox Cliff Estates,.
 - Connect Teeters Road to Morgan Street in order to serve the Martinsville Golf Course.
 - There is a finger system off of Morgan Street that serves a local church.
 - Construct access road south from Teeters Road to SR 44.
 - How will Teeters Road connect to the fish hatcheries?
 - Consider safety measures for the southbound approach into Martinsville. Specifically, reduce the grade of existing SR 37 if/when it is converted to I-69.
- ii. Infrastructure and Development:
- City and County have proposed a trail on the south side of Martinsville. Not is formal plan now. May be adopted at the end of the year.
 - A sewage treatment plant is proposed near SR 144 and Waverly Road
 - A high pressure gas line is located near Big Bend Road
 - Access site to the White River in Waverly is closed due to IDNR not renewing the lease.
 - Currently looking for a new access location
 - Planned Unit Development homes, golf course, horse trails, Stone Bridge community was identified in 2008-09. PUD was approximately 1200 acres in 2008-09. Land is now being sold and development is not advancing.
- iii. Other Concerns/Comments:
- Mobile home community at Outer Driver and Industrial Drive
 - Section 8 housing near Mahalassville Road and Southview Drive.
 - Consider special outreach to South Street and East Street areas, near the high school.
 - Consider special outreach to rental communities
 - FEMA/INDOT acquired properties on Southview Drive
- c. Alternatives B and D:
- i. Access:



- Motorists going to Indianapolis will still use SR 37
 - Safety would be improved on SR 37 by making it limited access
- Interchange at SR 42 is preferred over Greencastle Road
- Unsure if Centenary Road interchange is necessary
- Traffic uses Henderson Ford Road to get to Centeron Road.
 - May need an interchange here for Alternative D
 - There is an elementary school on Centeron Road
- Alternatives B and D would be better if utilized SR 67 more
- Access road to Centeron Road
- Maintain access to power plant for EMS and Fire Departments
- SR 42 will need improvements
- Like the extension of Old SR 37
- Access on D can be limited because there is no dense development along the route
- Pedestrian bridge for elementary school is currently under construction in Brooklyn across White Lick Creek
- A grade separation at Watson Road is not likely needed since there is access from SR 144
- Businesses along SR 67 south of Mooresville need to have good access
- ii. Infrastructure and Development:
 - Not a lot of new development will occur in the floodplain
 - Not likely to provide a development benefit to the Brooklyn community
 - TOA is a major local employer that needs to be considered
 - Economic development occurring in northern Morgan County and southern Hendricks County near I-70
 - New industrial park north of I-70, approximately 550 acres
 - TIF district- West Point Business District
 - Concern with existing and proposed pipelines
 - New natural gas plant and pipelines planned to cross the alternatives
 - Existing gas line between Greenfield Road and County Line Road
 - Mooresville Gateway project to improve road and entrance into Mooresville
 - Monrovia sewage treatment plant north of SR 42 and east of SR 39
 - TIF district at SR 39 interchange, west of SR 67
 - Interchange on I-70 would be beneficial to this district
 - B is preferred for economic development
 - Concern over future growth around interchanges.
- iii. Other Comments/Concerns:
 - Alternative B is preferred over D because of less impacts to development
 - Apartment complexes near SR 67 and SR 144 are potential areas of EJ concern
 - Trucks are likely to still use SR 37, splitting the truck traffic between the two routes.
 - 37 still the most direct route for trucks not going to west side complexes
 - Additional traffic will be put on I-465. How will that be addressed?
 - Concern over how the communities will react to new truck traffic



- County planning a greenway between Waverly access site and White River access site.
 - Mooresville Schools should be invited to attend CAC meetings.
 - Concern over the east/west travel to the schools over the alternatives
 - Echo Lake and Country Manor are mobile home communities that might need special outreach
 - Concern over the poverty level in Brooklyn, it could be a potential EJ issue
 - Concern over mutual aid for the fire departments
- d. Alternatives K3 and K4
- i. Access:
- Concerns over traffic, accessibility, and safety for Southport Road and Mann Road area.
 - Concern over the elimination of the Mann Road ramps onto I-465
 - Interchange with SR 144 important to maintain access for Bargersville.
 - K4 preferred over K3 because of the interchange with SR 144
 - Concern over the lack of grade separations between I-465 and Southport Road, particularly the Banta Road area.
 - Henderson Ford Road interchange preferable to Egbert Road.
 - Concern over Henderson Ford Road maintaining its crossing of the White River
 - Would like access to Centennial Road from the interchange.
 - Would like to see an interchange at Landersdale Road.
 - For economic development and access to Heartland Crossing
 - Concern over why Mann Road has become an option again when it was eliminated in Tier 1.
 - Concern over the limited access in Morgan County, especially in the Waverly area.
 - Consider an interchange at County Line Road as well as SR 144
 - Maintain easy access to Mallow Run Winery
 - Major tourist destination
 - Main access from Whiteland Road
- ii. Infrastructure and Development:
- Concern of industrial development at SR 67/Kentucky Avenue/Camby Road area.
 - Alternatives provide little opportunity for economic development in Morgan County.
 - K3 dissects NE corner of Morgan County TIF district.
 - Consider future residential development
 - Windsor Addition at Hadley Road and Mann Road- low to moderate income.
 - Master plan for Southwestway Park shows future expansion for an aquatic center at Southport Road.
 - Concern over impacts to Southwestway Park
 - Southwestway Park uses Land and Conservation Funds as well as Heritage Funds



- Solar panels on the southwest corner of Mann Road and Southport Road.
 - Sewage treatment plant on NW corner of SR 37 and SR 144
 - County park being developed in Waverly
 - Riverside Trail to connect to Morgan-Monroe State Forest
 - Concern over other regional trails
 - There is the potential for development to the west along County Line Road
 - Could there be a buffer such as sport parks, etc between Mann Road and I-69?
- iii. Other Comments/Concerns:
- Question and concerns over the traffic currently and the potential increase in traffic at Mann Road and I-465
 - Trucks will remain on SR 37 because of existing infrastructure.
 - Concerns over the traffic impacts on Southport Road
 - Concerns of the extent of floodway mitigation
 - Concerns over quality of life, public safety, and access routes.
 - Concerns over the amount of traffic being added to I-465
 - Decatur Township should be represented on the CAC
 - Schools, emergency access, etc.
 - Prefer over Alternatives B and D
 - Noise will change the nature of Southwestway Park
 - Concern over truck traffic between I-69 and SR 37.

V. Group presentation

- a. A five minute presentation was given by each group spokesperson. The presentations focused on the most pertinent issues for each alternative.

Details discussed in this meeting are subject to change. This summary is a reflection of the status of these items at the close of the meeting.

These meeting minutes represent the understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments or revisions to the attention of Christine Meador at cmeador@HNTB.com.

Note: This meeting summary documents ongoing, internal agency deliberations. Accordingly, the information contained in this summary is considered to be pre-decisional and deliberative.



FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

Section 6 Community Advisory Committee (CAC)

Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) #4

Perry Meridian High School

401 W. Meridian School Road, Indianapolis, Indiana

November 30, 2015 from 4:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m. EDT

Attendee	Organization
Pat Andrews	Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations
John Ayres	Hendricks County
Bob Babcock	IN Railroad Company
Lindsey Beckman	Morgan County Economic Development Corporation
Anne Bono	Hoosier Voices for I-69
Bill Boyd	Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations
Stephanie Belch	Indianapolis MPO
Shannetta Giffin	Indianapolis Airport Authority
Justin Groenert	Southwest IN Chamber of Commerce
Kenny Hale	Morgan County
Liz Irwin	Smithville Fiber
Dr. Thomas Little	Perry Township Schools
William Long	Center Grove School Corporation
David Marcotte	Mooreville School Corporation
Luke Mastin	Johnson County
Steve Oschman	Greater Mooreville Advisory Committee
Greg McKelfresh	South Central Indiana REMC
Cheryl Morphew	Johnson County Development Corporation
Mike Pelham	Johnson County
Jeremy Pell	White River Township Fire Department
Paul Peoni	City of Greenwood
Tony Perona	Town of Plainfield
Jeff Quyle	Morgan County Council
Joe Tutterrow	Morgan County Parks and Recreation
Ron West	Johnson County
Marc Westfall	Perry Township Schools
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Jim Earl	INDOT
Katie Rounds	INDOT
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Robert Dirks	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	HNTB Corporation
Tim Miller	HNTB Corporation
Kia Gillette	Lochmueller Group



- I. Introductions
 - a. Introduction of Project Team; members of the Project Team will be available to answer questions at the public meetings
 - b. Introduction of CAC and SWG members
- II. Purpose of the Meeting
 - a. Share information on the 5 preliminary alternatives
 - b. Discuss activities since last meeting and next steps
 - c. Gather comments on the preliminary alternatives; comments are due by December 17
 - d. Presentation is the same as what will be shown at the public meetings on November 30, December 2 and 3
- III. Presentation, Table and Maps
 - a. INDOT gave a PowerPoint presentation discussing the 5 preliminary alternatives, discussed a table of performance measures and environmental impacts, cost comparison bar chart and showed alternative maps.
- IV. Discussion and Questions
 - a. Will all 5 preliminary alternatives be carried forward in the DEIS?
 - i. No, it is not anticipated that all 5 alternatives will be carried into the DEIS. The team will be using cost, environmental impacts, performance measures and public comments to refine the number of alternatives. The DEIS will identify the preferred alternative.
 - b. Do you have a maximum number of reasonable alternatives?
 - i. No, the data and information will drive the decision-making process.
 - c. For Alternatives B and D that use I-70, would improvements be needed on I-70?
 - i. Yes, some improvements on I-70 from the tie-in to SR 267 are anticipated. These improvements are anticipated to occur in the median and no additional right-of-way is anticipated along I-70.
 - d. At the previous CAC/SWG meeting we discussed trying to make the travel time performance measure more clear on the table. Was this done?
 - i. The No Build travel time was included in the table and a footnote was added explaining that travel times are based on the shortest path chosen by a typical driver, not necessarily using I-69.
 - e. On the table, the property impacts are listed in acres. Are relocations included at this stage of the study?
 - i. Structure relocation estimates are also included in the table, but are considered estimates at this point. In addition the relative cost comparisons include property impacts (with consideration of location) and relocations.
 - f. On the table, the length of the alternative could be misleading if they all do not stop at the same point on I-465. Should all of the alternatives terminate at the same location?
 - i. The distances of each alternative is to I-465, which was designated as the end point in Tier 1. The length of Alternatives B/D include up to I-70 and then the distance on I-70 to the I-465/I-70 interchange. The Tier 1 selected corridor did not define a specific location on I-465. The travel time savings compares the travel time savings to different locations for the 5 alternatives. This will be clarified in the Screening Report.



- g. When you look at economic benefits, did you look at assessed valuation along the alternatives?
 - i. Specific parcel data was not included in the regional economic analysis. Variances in tax assessments are not within the specifications of the economic model (TREDIS). The TREDIS model was used to estimate increased wages and economic benefits from the interstate.
- h. What is an estimate cost of a bridge over the White River?
 - i. This would vary depending upon the bridge location and length. A rough estimate would be \$5 to \$25 million.
- i. Is the footprint for determining environmental impacts based on a 400-foot width?
 - i. The width is approximately 400 feet wide, but will vary some based on terrain and need to local access roads, grade separations and interchanges. This footprint should be considered preliminary at this time.
- j. What is the cost estimate for Alternative C, which is shown as 100% on the relative cost comparison bar chart?
 - i. There is not an specific cost number at this time because information is still in the preliminary stages. The comparative costs are not anticipated to change but an accurate cost estimate has not yet been completed. This will be done for the reasonable alternatives in the DEIS.
- k. Why is there no SR 37 construction cost shown for Alternative C on the relative cost comparison bar chart?
 - i. Because SR 37 will be I-69 and that cost is shown as the I-69 construction cost. For this comparison, it was assumed about 40% of the existing pavement on SR37 will be reused. The other alternatives may include additional improvements to SR 37 beyond the interstate construction.
- l. How were the potential interchange locations identified?
 - i. Potential interchange locations were based on projected future traffic volumes, public input, safety, and access considerations. INDOT is seeking comment on the proposed locations.
- m. In Martinsville, why does the grade separation at Grand Valley Drive connect to York versus South Street?
 - i. Grade separation locations are still preliminary and we are asking for feedback on them. Martinsville High School prefers a South Street connection. Additional conversations with both entities will likely occur regarding the grade separation at this location. INDOT will coordinate with the school corporation and the City to determine the selected connection.
- n. Why was an interchange at Southport Road chosen for the K Alternatives? This may not make sense if an outer loop is constructed from Southport to the west.
 - i. We are not aware of a planned outer loop in this area and the Indianapolis MPO has not expressed any concerns about the interchange location. This location was chosen due to the bridge over the White River. The team is aware of the potential of extending Southport Road west from Mann Road to High School road.
- o. For Alternatives B and D, the table shows 10 miles of existing interstate. What does this mean?



- i. This includes the portion of the Alternatives that are on I-70, from the tie in at I-70 to I-465.
- p. On the table, for the variations shown in the economic benefits, were these based on the interchange location or number of highway miles?
 - i. These numbers are based on the TREDIS model, not just by the number of interchanges or length. It is a regional benefit for the 4-county study area.
- q. On the relative cost comparison bar chart, is it too early to assume the K Alternatives will be removed due to cost?
 - i. Yes, INDOT wants to present the alternatives to the public and collect public comments prior to the next round of screening.
- r. For the regional economic impact, do you factor in added travel time for people traveling due to roads that are cut off by the interstate?
 - i. No, this is not included. It may be a good idea to have the economic modelers attend the next meeting to provide additional detail on model inputs. The TREDIS model is used nationally for economic modeling.
- s. Could a copy of the presentation be emailed to the CAC/SWG members?
 - i. Yes, this will be emailed after the meeting.

Details discussed in this meeting are subject to change. This summary is a reflection of the status of these items at the close of the meeting.

These meeting minutes represent the understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments or revisions to the attention of Sarah Rubin at srubin@indot.in.us

Note: This meeting summary documents ongoing, internal agency deliberations. Accordingly, the information contained in this summary is considered to be pre-decisional and deliberative.



FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
Section 6 Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) #5
 Morgan County Division of Family Resources
 7851 Waverly Road Martinsville, IN 46151
 March 29, 2016 from 8:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. EDT

Attendee	Organization
CAC North – 8-10am	
Pat Andrews	Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations
Bob Babcock	IN Railroad Company
Shannetta Giffin	Indianapolis Airport Authority
Jason Holliday	City County Councilor
David Holt	Conexus
Andrew Klinger	Town of Plainfield
Christian Maslowski	Greater Greenwood Chamber of Commerce
Cheryl Morphew	Johnson County Development Corporation
Ron West	Johnson County Commissioner
Jeff Wilson	White River Township Fire Department
CAC South – 10:15-12:15	
Terry Anderson	Martinsville Fire Department
Lindsay Beckman	Morgan County EDC
Anne Bono	Bloomington Chamber of Commerce
Justin Groenert	SW IN Chamber of Commerce
Kenny Hale	Morgan County Planning
Shannon Kohl	City of Martinsville
Derek McGilvray	Morgan County 3 Creeks Community
Greg McKelfresh	South Central Indiana REMC
Steve Oschman	Greater Mooresville Advisory Committee
Jamie Thompson Taylor	Martinsville Chamber of Commerce
Joe Tutterrow	Morgan County Parks and Recreation
Norman Voyles	Morgan County
CAC South Guests	
Terry Brock	Morgan County Surveyor
Tosha Daugherty	Visit Morgan County
Mark Mathis	Mooresville Town Council
Kenny Murphy	Martinsville Police Department
David Marcotte	Mooresville School Corporation
Stakeholder Working Group – 2-4pm	
John Ayres	Hendricks County
Stephanie Belch	Indianapolis MPO
Luke Mastin	Johnson County
Larry Smith	Morgan County
Travis Underhill	City of Franklin
I-69 Project Team – 8am-4pm	
Jim Earl	INDOT
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	HNTB Corporation
Tim Miller	HNTB Corporation
Chris Meador	HNTB Corporation
Eric Swickard	Lochmueller Group



- I. Welcome
- II. Introductions
 - a. Introduction of CAC and SWG members and project team
- III. Project Update
 - a. Jim Earl updated the meeting attendees about the upcoming release of the Preliminary Alternative Screening Report, press conference, and upcoming Public Information Meetings (PIMs).
- IV. Draft Public Information Meeting Presentation
 - a. Jim gave the presentation to the CAC/SWG members that will be given at the PIMs.
- V. Discussion and Questions
 - A. CAC North**
 - Q. Will a performance matrix be provided for Alternative Alignments C1, C2, and C3?
 - A. Yes, Appendix B of the Preliminary Alternative Screening Report provides performance measures and natural and human environmental impacts per Alternative.
 - Q. Are the interchange locations roughly the same as the last CAC meeting?
 - A. An interchange at Ohio Street is now under consideration.
 - Q. Where will the public meetings be held?
 - A. April 4th at Perry Meridian High School and April 5th at Martinsville High School
 - Q. Can you describe the public input you received on the Alternatives?
 - A. Tim Miller explained that as a result of the November 30, December 2-3 public meetings, there were several comments supporting Alternative C in lieu of supporting the western alternatives. Tim stressed the process is not a vote. However, public input is always considered in the alternative selection process.
 - Q. Was there support for Alternative C among residents who live along SR 37 or just support amongst those who live on B, D, K3, and K4?
 - A. Yes, INDOT received support from a variety of locations.
 - Q. Can you explain the right of way verses construction limits on the displays that will be presented at the public information meetings?
 - A. Jim explained the legends on the map displays.
 - Q. Is there potential to collaborate with INDOT's contractor for local governments to "piggy back" on the construction of I-69, Section 6?
 - A. It will depend on the type of collaboration. However, INDOT will be working with local government agencies to collect feedback on the proposed local access roads. INDOT will pay for the construction cost of the proposed local access roads while the local agency is responsible for long term maintenance.
 - Q. Will a funding source have to be identified in the EIS?
 - A. Potential funding sources will be addressed in the Final EIS and Record of Decision.
 - Q. How did you decide how many interchanges to identify?
 - A. Current and projected traffic volumes, spacing, and public input are factors considered when determining interchange locations.
 - Q. Why are there more interchange locations in Martinsville than Marion County?
 - A. Tim and Jim explained the reasoning for each interchange and grade separation location in Marion County. They also explained why an interchange at Ohio Street is now under consideration.



- Q. Will you be impacting Sunshine Gardens neighborhood on the north end of the project?
- A. There may be some impacts but it is the intent to either avoid or minimize impacts to the neighborhood.
- Q. Is the final alignment decision with the locals?
- A. No, INDOT in conjunction with FHWA will make the final decisions. INDOT will reach out to the local agencies to obtain their feedback. Any roads that will be ultimately maintained by the locals will require coordination with the respective local agencies.
- Q. Is it possible for local agencies to piggy back on the State's environmental process?
- A. It is possible, but it is something that needs further consideration.
- Q. Can you explain why you eliminated non-Alternative C options?
- A. B, D, K3 and K4 did not perform as well overall as Alternative C. The other Alternatives did not merit consideration to advance forward for detailed analysis.
- Q. A CAC member advised INDOT to be cautious about support for the Commerce Connector, at least concerning the local governments.
- A. INDOT selected Alternative C based on the Purpose and Need for the Section 6 project. Section 6 was never intended to support the Commerce Connector. They are independent projects.
- Q. What techniques can you apply to protect the Perry Aquifer?
- A. INDOT will evaluate the current and future condition and summarize its findings and any mitigation measures in the final EIS.
- Q. How much new roadway will be constructed along I-465?
- A. INDOT anticipates construction along I-465 to be from Mann Road to US 31. The final determination will be made in conjunction with FHWA.
- Q. How much will traffic increase when Section 6 is constructed?
- A. Traffic forecasts are ongoing.
- Q. Is this the point in the process when INDOT considers noise walls?
- A. INDOT is conducting a noise study which will be included in the EIS. The study will determine approximate locations where noise barriers will be considered in the design phase. A final decision regarding noise barrier locations will be made in the design phase.
- Q. What sort of capacity for future expansion is INDOT considering?
- A. INDOT is planning the interstate to accommodate projected traffic in 2045.
- Q. Do you have a ceiling cost that you cannot exceed?
- A. No, there is not a "cap" for Section 6. INDOT is mindful of cost and will be developing alternatives that meet the Purpose and Need and does so in an efficient manner.

B. CAC South

- Q. Can you "piecemeal" the Alternatives together?
- A. For the most part yes; at least regarding interchanges and overpasses. Design criteria for the mainline is more difficult to piece together.
- Q. Do you still have a spacing requirement for interchange locations?
- A. Yes, the spacing requirement is 1 mile in an urban area and 3 miles in a rural area.
- Q. A significant issue for many constituents is how many lanes will be constructed.



- A. The highway will be designed to accommodate 2045 forecasted traffic. It is anticipated that 2 through lanes (4 total) will be constructed from SR 39 to SR 144, 3 through lanes (6 total) from SR144 to Southport Road, and 4 through lanes (8 total) from Southport Road to I-465. Truck climbing lanes and/or an auxiliary lane will be considered where appropriate.
- Q. Will all the through lanes be elevated through Martinsville? Can you think of other examples of a similar roadway in Indiana?
- A. Elevating the I-69 mainline travel lanes on fill is an option. Interchanges along US 31 through Carmel and Westfield are elevated in this manner. Portions of the Lloyd Expressway are also elevated. The commenter noted that elevated highways are less desirable esthetically. Elevated does not mean on piers.
- Q. How will work on the SR 39 bridge over the White River be reused?
- A. This project is not expected to extend to the SR 39 bridge over the White River. INDOT does not have any plans to widen SR 39 as part of this project outside of the I-69/SR39 interchange limits.
- Q. Are there any monies to relocate a firehouse that will now be separated by I-69?
- A. Not that INDOT is aware of. It doesn't pay damages for separating firehouses from those individuals it serves.
- Q. Traffic is increasing in Martinsville due to construction of Section 5. Specifically at the intersection of SR 37 and SR 252. It has experienced fatal accidents prior to the start of Section 5 construction.
- A. Yes, INDOT is currently evaluating and considering measures to warn motorists exiting/entering the Section 5 construction zone.
- Q. There has been an uptick of semi-trucks along SR 39 (and SR 144) due to the construction of Section 5. How will INDOT address this?
- A. Jim acknowledged this is likely occurring due to the overall construction season has begun, not just Section 5. See above response.
- Q. Will Section 6 be constructed all at the same time?
- A. Construction phasing is not known at this time.
- Q. Is the fire at the Flying J at I-456 / SR 37 going to affect the project?
- A. No.
- Q. Is it okay to arrange a meeting with our larger constituencies?
- A. Yes, in fact INDOT encourages you to disseminate this information back to your larger organization.
- Q. Will these maps be available on the project website?
- A. Yes, INDOT will place the will place the maps on the project website after the first PIM.
- Q. Who maintains the overpasses once they are constructed?
- A. Local government agencies maintain the local roadways. INDOT will maintain the interstate. Bridge structures (such as overpasses) are maintained by the State. Local improvements (such as adding capacity) would need to be approved by INDOT.
- Q. Are there policies regarding activities or conduct on overpasses?
- A. There is no known policy. Fencing on the overpasses can be considered.



- A. INDOT is conducting a noise study which will be included in the EIS. The study will determine approximate locations where noise barriers will be considered in the design phase. A final decision regarding noise barrier locations will be made in the design phase.

C. Stakeholder Working Group

- Q. Is there a location where impacts are disclosed to support INDOT's decision?
 - A. Yes, impact tables are shown in the Screening Report.
- Q. Is there an opportunity for locals to partner with INDOT to develop and construct local access roads beyond the scope of Section 6?
 - A. Possibly, INDOT will need to examine the possibility to collaborate with the locals on such projects.
- Q. Is there a planning grant program for Section 6?
 - A. No, that planning process was completed as part of a Tier 1 commitment.
- Q. How will the interchange at I-465 be constructed.
 - A. A new interchange will be constructed to the west of the current I-465/SR 37 interchange. Added capacity might be warranted along I-465 to accommodate additional traffic.
- Q. The footprint of the interchanges is quite large. Might not be much ROW left once it is constructed.
 - A. Comment noted
- Q. Can INDOT "tweak" a design if a developer wants to change access based on a development?
 - A. Yes, but it may require a re-evaluation document. INDOT prefers to work with developers earlier in the process.
- Q. Can the displays be made available to SWG members?
 - A. Maps of Alternatives C1, C2, and C3 are available in the Screening Report, which is available on the project website. The PIM displays will be available on the project website.
- Q. For roads located within a floodplain will they be designed to Q100 standards?
 - A. The design of local access roads in floodplain is dependent upon the functional class. The draft EIS will address this topic.
- Q. What is the limited access set back from the interchange locations?
 - A. It's based on sight distance requirements, but it's approximately ¼ mile.
- Q. Has funding been determined for the project?
 - A. No.

VI. Next Steps / Schedule

- a. Jim Earl explained the overall project schedule remains the same. A Draft EIS will be issued in the first quarter, 2017. A Record of Decision (ROD) is anticipated to be issued in the first quarter, 2018.

VII. Adjourn

Details discussed in this meeting are subject to change. This summary is a reflection of the status of these items at the close of the meeting. These meeting minutes represent the understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments or revisions to the attention of LaMar Holliday at lholliday@indot.in.gov.



MEETING MINUTES

Section 6 Community Advisory Committees (CAC)

Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) #6

Morgan County Division of Family Resources

7851 Waverly Road Martinsville, IN 46151

June 28, 2016 from 8:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m. EDT

Attendee	Organization
CAC North	
Pat Andrews	Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations
Bill Long	Center Grove School Corporation
Shannetta Griffin	Indianapolis Airport Authority
Jason Holliday	City County Councilor
David Holt	Conexus
Amy Cornell	IN Farm Bureau
Christian Maslowski	Greater Greenwood Chamber of Commerce
Cheryl Morphew	Johnson County Development Corporation
Ron West	Johnson County Commissioner
Jeremy Pell	White River Township Fire Dept.
Joe Krebsbach	Indianapolis Fire Department
Julie Young	Town of Bargersville
CAC South	
Anne Bono	Bloomington Chamber of Commerce
Justin Groenert	SW IN Chamber of Commerce
Derek McGilvray	Morgan County 3 Creeks Community
Greg McKelfresh	South Central Indiana REMC
Steve Oschman	Greater Mooresville Advisory Committee
Ryan Goodwin (for Jeff Quyle)	Morgan County Council
Jamie Thompson-Taylor	Martinsville Chamber of Commerce
Dennis Mills (for Michelle Moore)	Martinsville Schools
Joe Tutterrow	Morgan County Parks and Recreation
Terry Anderson	Martinsville Fire Department
Tosha Daugherty (observer)	Visit Morgan County
Stakeholder Working Group	
Anna Gremling	Indianapolis MPO
Meredith Klekotka	Indianapolis DMD
Mark Zwoyer	Indianapolis DPW
I-69 Project Team	
Jim Earl	INDOT
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Tim Miller	HNTB Corporation
Matt Miller	HNTB Corporation
Eric Swickard	Lochmueller Group

I. Welcom

e/Introductions/New Member Recognition

Sarah Rubin asked CAC members to identify whether they would like to continue participating in future CAC meetings. They can denote on the sign-in sheet as such. The intent is to not exclude anyone, but determine whether any existing member can no longer make the commitment.



II. Project Update

Tim Miller provided an update on the status of the project and an overview of comments received during the April 4th and 5th Public Information Meetings (PIMs). He also shared a list of organizations and groups INDOT has met with since the PIMs.

III. Alternative Development

- a. Matt Miller identified changes to the project alternatives as a result of the PIMs and stakeholder meetings. He also discussed the traffic analysis that is currently being conducted for the project alternatives.
- b. Jim Earl discussed ongoing coordination with local government agencies regarding improvements in the corridor. While the I-69 project will be constructed by INDOT, some related projects to improve local road circulation will be the responsibility of local agencies.

IV. Project Communication

Sarah Rubin discussed a variety of upcoming project communications and outreach activities:

- a. A Business Needs Survey will be distributed to businesses within 1 mile of the project. Anticipated to be sent out the week of July 11.
- b. Notice of Survey letters will be sent for field investigation activities in a few targeted areas. Anticipated to be sent out the week of July 11.
- c. New I-69 Section 6 Twitter and Facebook accounts will be established in the next several weeks.
- d. Special efforts have been made to identify Environmental Justice communities, and community meetings will be scheduled to make sure residents are aware of the project.
- e. A Real Estate Open House will be conducted in late July or August. The date and location is to be determined. This will address general questions regarding the process and timing of right of way acquisition and relocation.

V. Questions/Statements and Responses

A. CAC North

- Q. Will the existing SR 37 connection to I-465 remain?
 - A. It is currently planned to retain the existing Harding Street/I-465 interchange.
- S. Please consider improvements to I-465 west of Kentucky Avenue to I-70. Truck traffic causes weaving and congestion concerns.
- S. The two lane ramp from I-465 to I-70 west is dangerous. Consider additional improvements on the ramp.
- Q. Have you been in contact with Marion County/City of Indianapolis regarding upgrading County Line Road to four lanes?
 - A. Yes, Indianapolis is in the process of updating its Thoroughfare Plan. The type of project and timing has not been determined.
- Q. How are you deciding who pays for these “local projects”?
 - A. INDOT will work with local officials to determine how to fund local improvements. This typically occurs in the early portion of the design phase.



- Q. Discussions with INDOT were held regarding connecting Bluff Road between Smith Valley and Fairview Road. Has a determination been made yet?
- A. The project team looked into the possibility and the impacts seemed to be too significant.
- Q. Has INDOT looked at “wiggling” the right of way to avoid impacts?
- A. Yes, it depends on available right of way and potential impacts.
- Q. How do you compensate business owners who might lose their existing access to SR 37?
- A. INDOT does not compensate for loss of direct access. Efforts are made to accommodate access and logistics concerns when possible.
- S. Please keep in mind that farm ground is a business. It’s not development that’s just “waiting to happen”. Also be mindful about how farm equipment will access the roadway.
- Q. Do you calculate negative impacts on property values along with positive ones?
- A. The overall change in tax base for each county will be estimated. However, changes in the value of individual properties caused by the project are speculative and are not quantified.
- Q. How will the project be funded?
- A. The Indiana State Legislator is expected to consider a funding mechanism during the next legislative session.
- Q. When does a funding source need to be identified?
- A. A funding source has to be identified in the Final EIS.
- Q. Can you notify CAC members before the Business Needs Surveys are distributed?
- A. Yes.
- B. CAC South
- Q. Is there a way to better communicate that the public comment period during the public meeting is not a question / answer session?
- A. INDOT will examine ways to better reinforce that the comment period is not a question/answer session.
- S. Concerns have been raised about emergency service response times to the Foxcliff community.
- Q. Will noise impacts increase considering there will be fewer stop lights when I-69 becomes an interstate?
- A. Noise impacts will be presented and analyzed in the Draft EIS.
- S. It was greatly appreciated that INDOT met with the Morgan County Three Creeks Neighborhood Alliance steering committee.
- Q. A committee member just returned from Seattle where stop lights are used on ramps for each car. Is any consideration being given to taking this approach with the I-465 / I-69 interchange?
- A. Ramp metering is not being considered for this project at this time.
- Q. The C1 mainline profile (20 + feet above existing SR 37 grade), is it still under consideration?
- A. Yes, all three Alternatives will be evaluated in the Draft EIS.
- Q. Will the Facebook page be marketed?
- A. INDOT will examine how best to reach project stakeholders.



C. Stakeholder Working Group

- S. Little Buck Creek is an important E/W trail connection. There are few E/W connections in southern Marion County.
- Q. Does the I-465 / I-69 connection still impact the gravel pits.
 - A. Yes, but different alternatives have different impacts.
- Q. Will C4 (Preferred Alternative) be released in the Draft EIS or before?
 - A. C4 will not be released to the public until the Draft EIS is issued.
- S. DMD would like a copy of traffic forecasts for Section 6. They would like this information for their Thoroughfare Plan.
- Q. Will INDOT fund local improvement projects related to the construction of I-69?
 - A. INDOT is open to discussion with local agencies.
- Q. Where are the Environmental Justice (EJ) communities located?
 - A. There are numerous EJ communities located throughout the I-69 study area.

VI. Adjourn

Details discussed in this meeting are subject to change. This summary is a reflection of the status of these items at the close of the meeting.

These meeting minutes represent the understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments or revisions to the attention of Sarah Rubin at srubin@indot.in.us

Note: This meeting summary documents ongoing, internal agency deliberations. Accordingly, the information contained in this summary is considered to be pre-decisional and deliberative.



MEETING MINUTES

**Section 6 Community Advisory Committees (CAC)
Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) #7**

Morgan County Division of Family Resources
7851 Waverly Road Martinsville, IN 46151

September 27, 2016 from 8:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m. EDT

Attendee	Organization
CAC North	
Bob Babcock	Indiana Railroad Company
Jason Holliday	Marion County City-County Councilor
Joe Krebsbach	Indianapolis Fire Department
Patrick Mapes	Perry Township School Corporation
Bill Long	Center Grove School Corporation
Shannon LeMaster	Family Social Services Administration
CAC South	
Jamie Thompson-Taylor	Martinsville Chamber of Commerce
Tosha Daughtery	Visit Morgan County
Dennis Mills	Martinsville School Corporation
Derek McGilvery	Morgan County Three Creeks Neighborhood Alliance
Steve Oschman	Greater Mooresville Area Committee
Joe Tutterrow	Morgan County Parks and Recreation
Katelyn Hurt	Morgan County Economic Development Organization
Stakeholder Working Group	
Paul Peoni	City of Greenwood
Luke Mastin	Johnson County Highway Department
Neil VanTrees	Johnson County Engineer
Stephanie Belch	Indy MPO
Larry Smith	Morgan County Engineer
I-69 Project Team	
Chris Meador	HNTB
Adin McCann	HNTB
Tim Miller	HNTB
Eric Swickard	Lochmueller Group
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Jim Earl	INDOT
Laura Hilden	INDOT

A. Formal Presentation

- I. Welcome
- II. Project Update (Sarah Rubin)
 - a. Project schedule – Sarah updated the CAC members on the project’s overall schedule.
 - b. Real Estate meeting – Sarah gave a brief summary of the Real Estate meetings INDOT recently hosted.
- III. Environmental Justice (Adin McCann / Chris Meador)
 - a. Purpose – Adin discussed the purpose and goal of Environmental Justice
 - b. Community of Comparison (COC) – Chris discussed how the project team’s methodology for identifying the COC.



- c. Additional Outreach – Chris encouraged CAC/SWG members to reach out to minority and/or low income populations about the project. Please contact the project team if you are aware of good meeting locations to host these meetings or have suggestions on contacts in the community whom could provide the INDOT project team additional information on low income or minority populations in the project area or should be provide the community organization survey.
- IV. Section 106 (Tim Miller)
- a. Eligibility and Effects – Tim discussed eligibility criteria for a property to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Tim also discussed how the I-69, Section 6 project will effect historic resources within the project’s Area of Potential Effect (APE).
 - b. German Market Historic District – Tim identified where the Southside German Market Gardeners Historic District (SGMGHD) is located and what impacts the project might have on it. He also discussed that mitigation would be required for any adverse effects to the district. A meeting will be held with members of the SGMGHD to determine what sort of mitigation is appropriate.
- V. Fall Activities (Sarah Rubin)
- a. Archeology – Last fall INDOT completed archeological work for the portion of the project from Martinsville to Henderson Ford Road. INDOT will conduct archeological surveys from Henderson Ford Road to I-465 this fall.
 - b. Targeted outreach – Special meetings for low income or minority communities will be held along the corridor.
 - c. Refining project Alternatives – INDOT is continuing to make refinements to the project alternatives based on feedback.
 - d. Coordination with the SGMGHD – INDOT will meet with residents and stakeholders within this historic district.
 - e. Continued stakeholder involvement – INDOT will continue to update local project stakeholders on an as needed basis.
 - f. Noise analysis – The project team has collected ambient noise readings for the project. Build. Noise impacts will be modeled for the project and provided in the Draft EIS.
 - g. Traffic analysis – INDOT is continuing to make refinements to traffic forecasts.
- VI. Fourth Quarter Meetings (Sarah Rubin)
- a. Topics – Sarah identified potential topics for the 4th quarter CAC/SWG meetings.
 - b. Combined CACs – INDOT is considering combining the three groups into one meeting for the next meeting.

B. Questions/Statements and Responses

Question: Will Section 6 be delivered as a P3 (Public Private Partnership) project?

Response: A brief explanation of the P3 process was provided by INDOT. A couple example INDOT projects (Section 5 and East End Bridge) were also provided. A project delivery method has not been identified for Section 6.

Question: Will the timing/completion of Section 5 impact the construction of Section 6?

Response: The construction of Section 6 is not dependent on the construction of Section 5. Section 6 will be completed on its own independent schedule.

Question: Are you asking CAC members to help you identify other pockets of low income or



Response: Yes, please forward us information identifying any populations we have not identified through our research.

Question: How will the construction of the project impact low income or minority populations?

Response: Issues such as access to specific businesses are items we want to consider for this project. The goal is for the communities to tell INDOT how the project will impact these individuals.

Question: Do you evaluate noise impacts for historic properties?

Response: Yes, the project team has taken ambient noise readings. The project team will run Traffic Noise Modeling (TNM) to determine noise increases associated with the project.

Question: Will a similar sort of noise analysis be conducted for non-historic properties?

Response: Yes, the project team will evaluate noise impacts for non-historic properties within the project area.

Statement: The Foxcliff community appreciates INDOT proposing to open Kristi Road. However, the community is still concerned about the overall response time for EMS providers. Please continue to keep this in mind as the project advances forward.

Response: INDOT will continue to coordinate with local EMS providers to ensure an adequate response times.

Question: Would it be possible to obtain a copy of the Historic Properties Report?

Response: The Historic Properties Report will be included in the Appendix of the DEIS.

Question: Will the Draft EIS identify a Preferred Alternative?

Response: Yes, the I-69, Section 6 Draft EIS will identify a Preferred Alternative.

Question: Will the Draft EIS identify interchange types or just interchange locations? If so, how will INDOT determine the interchange type?

Response: Yes, the Draft EIS will identify interchange types. The type of interchange will be driven by traffic flow, minimizing environmental impacts and local considerations.

Question: What is your traffic design year?

Response: The design year is 2045.

Question: Have you met with local planning professionals?

Response: Yes, we conducted two land use panel meetings.

Question: How far from existing SR 37 does your model forecast?

Response: The I-69 Corridor Model forecasts traffic on significant roadways in Marion, Hendricks, Morgan and Johnson Counties.

Question: Will there be room to expand travel lanes in the future?

Response: At this time, INDOT is focusing on providing capacity to year 2045. There may be areas where additional lanes can be added in the future without additional right of way.

Question: Do you know the construction method yet?

Response: No, INDOT has not identified a delivery method yet.

Question: When will you buy right of way?

Response: Right of way acquisition will not begin in earnest until the Record of Decision is issued. (early 2018)

Question: Are there any karst features in Section 6?

Response: No.

Question: Is there an update on construction of Section 5?

Response: The new revised completion date is October, 2017. INDOT and IFA are working together to work with the Development Partners to get the project back on track.



Question: When does Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) considerations begin?

Response: It can be considered before the ROD, but CSS typically occurs in the design phase.

Question: What is the delineation between what INDOT and the local communities maintain?

Response: INDOT will coordinate with the local communities to determine maintenance responsibilities. INDOT typically maintains the bridges over the interstates, interchange areas, and mainline. INDOT will construct the local service roads but maintenance would then be assumed by the local agency.

C. Adjourn

Details discussed in this meeting are subject to change. This summary is a reflection of the status of these items at the close of the meeting.

These meeting minutes represent the understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments or revisions to the attention of Sarah Rubin at srubin@indot.in.us

Note: This meeting summary documents ongoing, internal agency deliberations. Accordingly, the information contained in this summary is considered to be pre-decisional and deliberative.



MEETING MINUTES
Section 6 Community Advisory Committees (CAC)
Stakeholder Working Group (SWG)
 Southland Community Church
 Greenwood, Indiana
 December 12, 2016 from 9:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.

Attendee	Organization
CAC North	
Pat Andrews	Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations
Jason Holliday	Marion County City-County Councilor
Joe Krebsbach	Indianapolis Fire Department
Mark Lawrence	Indiana Chamber of Commerce
Christian Maslowski	Greater Greenwood Chamber of Commerce
Jeremy Pell	White River Township Fire Department
Mark Westfall	Perry Township Schools
Steve Oschman	Greater Mooresville Advisory Committee
CAC South	
Tosha Daughtery	Visit Morgan County
Kenny Hale	Morgan County Planning
Bryan Lawrence	Morgan County Three Creeks Neighborhood Alliance
Greg McKelfresh	South Central IN REMC
Michelle Moore	Martinsville School Corp.
Jamie Thompson-Taylor	Martinsville Chamber of Commerce
Joe Tutterrow	Morgan County Parks and Recreation
Norman Voyles	Morgan County Commissioner
Stakeholder Working Group	
Stephanie Belch	Indy MPO
Mark Richards	City of Greenwood
Larry Smith	Morgan County Engineer
I-69 Project Team	
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Jim Earl	INDOT
Andy Dietrick	INDOT
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Eric Swickard	Lochmueller Group
Tim Miller	HNTB

I. Welcome

II. Project Update

- A. Alternative Refinements are being considered at the following locations:
 - a. Ohio Street – Slight modifications are being considered to minimize commercial and residential impacts within the interchange area.
 - b. SR 252/SR 44 – A cul-de-sac at Kristi Road was replaced with right-in/right-out access based on feedback from local EMS responders in order to improve response times to the area north and west of existing SR 37.
 - c. Stones Crossing Road – The west side frontage road was redesigned to avoid construction through the Oak Meadows / Greenwood Mobile Home Park.



- d. Waverly Library – SR 144 interchange was shifted slightly to the north to avoid additional water resource impacts. A retaining wall in front of the library will be proposed to reduce impacts to the library parking area.
- e. Southport Road – An option to shift Southport Road slightly to the north is being considered to reduce residential impacts in the interchange area.
- f. Epler Avenue – Revised access is being considered to allow drivers to access Epler Avenue off of I-69 instead of traversing through the I-465/I-69 interchange. A connection across I-69 for Edgewood Avenue is also being considered.

III. Project Outreach

- A. Neighborhood Gatherings – Meetings were held along the corridor for low income and minority communities on November 15, 16 and 17, 2016.
 - a. Summaries
 - b. Survey Results
- B. Southside German Market Historic District – A meeting was held with residents within the Southside German Market Historic District on October 4, 2016. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an update on the project and to discuss the potential impacts the project will have on the neighborhood as well as potential mitigation options INDOT can provide in order to mitigate those impacts.
- C. Project Office will be closed from December 26, 2016 to January 2, 2017.

IV. Recent/Ongoing Fieldwork

- A. Archaeology – Field investigations were completed in November, 2016.
- B. Mitigation Site Investigations – A mitigation site tour was held on November 9 and 10, 2016 with resource agency staff members.

V. Project Schedule

- A. Legal Sufficiency/Prior Concurrence Review – This is expected to occur in January 2017.
- B. Publication of DEIS – The document is on schedule to be released in late first quarter 2017.

VI. Question and Answers

Question: Do you know where noise barriers will be located along Section 6? Have criteria been established yet?

Response: The Draft EIS will disclose the location where noise barriers could be located. The criteria is based on feasible and reasonable criteria from INDOT’s noise policy.

Question: When and where will the Section 6 public hearings be held?

Response: Two public hearing meetings will likely be held in the project area. One will likely be held in the northern and one in the southern portion of the project area. The meetings are likely to occur in late in the first quarter or April 2017.



Question: When should lighting concerns be raised?

Response: During the formal comment period of the Draft EIS.

Question: How much do things change between the Draft and Final EIS?

Response: Most environmental documents do not change considerably between a Draft and Final EIS. It's fair to expect that 90 percent of the document will remain unchanged.

Question: Will new mapping be made available based on the modifications you described today?

Response: Yes, new mapping will be available in the Draft EIS. INDOT does not anticipate preparing new mapping until after the Draft EIS is released.

Question: Is the mitigation INDOT is pursuing to compensate for impacts due to highway construction?

Response: Yes

Question: Would you consider purchasing mitigation land for greenway and trail projects?

Response: Yes, but mitigation sites are typically driven by USFWS and its desire to replace habitat for threatened and endangered species. There typically are restrictions on what the land can be used for.

Question: Who is leading the effort to secure mitigation properties for Section 6?

Response: Lochmueller Group is assisting INDOT with securing properties for Section 6.

VII. Adjourn

Details discussed in this meeting are subject to change. This summary is a reflection of the status of these items at the close of the meeting.

These meeting minutes represent the understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments or revisions to the attention of Sarah Rubin at srubin@indot.in.gov

Note: This meeting summary documents ongoing, internal agency deliberations. Accordingly, the information contained in this summary is considered to be pre-decisional and deliberative.



MEETING MINUTES
Section 6 Community Advisory Committees (CAC)
Stakeholder Working Group (SWG)
 Southland Community Church
 Greenwood, Indiana
 March 14, 2017 from 9:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.

Attendee	Organization
CAC North	
Anthony Krycka	City of Franklin
Dr. Kent DeKoninck	Greater Greenwood Chamber of Commerce
Jeremy Pell	White River Township Fire Department
Joe Krebsbach	Indianapolis Fire Department
Ron West	Johnson County
CAC South	
Craig Demontt	City of Martinsville
Joe Tutterrow	Morgan County Parks and Recreation
Katlyen Hurt	Morgan county EDC
Kenny Hale	Morgan County Planning
Michelle Moore	Martinsville School Corp.
Shannon Kohl	Mayor, City of Martinsville
Shannon LeMaster	Morgan county DFR
Steve Oschman	Greater Mooresville Advisory Committee
Tosha Daughtery	Visit Morgan County
Stakeholder Working Group	
Julie Young	Town of Bargersville
Larry Jones	Indianapolis DPW
Larry Smith	Morgan County Engineer
Nguyen Long	Marion County/Indianapolis
Stephanie Belch	Indianapolis MPO
I-69 Project Team	
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Jim Earl	INDOT
Andy Dietrick	INDOT
Katie Rounds	INDOT
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Tim Miller	HNTB
Chris Meador	HNTB

I. Welcome

II. Project Update

- A. INDOT is finalizing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and intends to release the DEIS soon for public comment.
- B. In conjunction with the release of the DEIS, INDOT will hold two public hearings, one in the north part of the project area and one in the south part of the project area. INDOT will review the hearing presentation with CAC-SWG members and welcomes any comments or suggestions on the presentation.



III. Review of Presentation

- A. Review of participants and schedule
- B. Review of how to provide comments
- C. Review of what is the DEIS and what it includes
- D. Review of community outreach and public meetings that have gone into project development process.
 - 1. Over 150 meetings with homeowners, business owners, local officials, etc.
 - 2. Public Information Meetings
 - 3. CAC-SWG – 8 meetings
 - 4. Real Estate Meetings
 - 5. Neighborhood Gatherings
- E. Understanding Map Displays - Reviewed information that will be on the mapping at the public hearing, at the project office and on the website
 - 1. Roadways and interchanges
 - 2. Bridges and retaining walls
 - 3. Potential relocations
 - 4. Potential noise barrier locations
 - 5. Local road right of way
 - 6. Limited access right of way
- F. By the Numbers
 - 1. 26 miles of new Interstate highway
 - 2. 10 interchange access points
 - 3. 16 over/underpasses
 - 4. 31.8 lane miles of new access roads
 - 5. 14 traffic signals eliminated
 - 6. 67 total bridges
 - 7. 30 existing rehabbed or replaced 37 new constructed
 - 8. 188 new Interstate lane miles when complete includes I-465
- G. Review of Travel Lanes
 - 1. SR 39 to SR 144: 4 travel lanes, 2 each direction
 - 2. SR144 to Southport Road: 6 travel lanes, 3 each direction
 - 3. Southport Road to I-465: 8 Lanes, 4 lanes each direction
- H. Review of Section 6 key decision areas
 - 1. Ohio Street Interchange
 - a. Provides direct access to downtown Martinsville
 - b. Improves safety and local access to I-69 with connection to local service roads
 - c. Supported by the City of Martinsville and Morgan County
 - 2. Grand Valley Boulevard
 - a. Provides connection to Cramertown Loop to SR 252 interchange



- b. Allows safe pedestrian crossing of SR 37 to Grand Valley Center
 - c. Supported by Martinsville High School, City and Morgan County
 3. Stones Crossing
 - a. Extends west side frontage road from SR 144 to Smith Valley Road interchange
 - b. Provides farm operators with a safe way to access fields without using I-69
 - c. Improves safety and local access east and west of I-69
 4. Southport Road – two alternatives. Only location where preferred alternative has not been recommended.
 - a. Alternative C4A shifts interchange to the east while C4B shifts it north
 - b. C4A reduces business impacts to Southport Landing Shopping Center
 - c. C4B reduces potential residential relocations at Aspen Lake Apartments
 - d. Final decision will be made in the Final EIS after public input
 5. Epler Avenue
 - a. Epler Interchange added in response to public and emergency responder comments
 6. I-465 / I-69 Interchange
 - a. Reduces impacts to businesses
 - b. Maintains access to Harding Street via I-69 and I-465
 - c. Reduces the number of bridge structures

IV. Question and Answers

Question: How is funding coming along?

Response: INDOT is completing an options analysis which will evaluate traditional design and contract options, a series of design-build options, a public private partnership (P3) option, evaluate review timeframes and cost. INDOT is completing this in conjunction with legislature review. Land acquisition and design takes a certain amount of time regardless of the funding source and therefore the construction cannot begin until that is completed. INDOT intends to finish the option analysis by May 2017.

Question: When and how can local government work to minimize costs for local access roads?

Response: Local service roads shown on the maps will be designed and constructed by INDOT. The locals will own and maintain the local service roads. Discussions can be started this summer regarding local access road agreements. If there are local access roads that are in the early planning stages, INDOT can work with local planning to assist communities in receiving consideration on applications for additional funding.



Question: What are the next steps in the DEIS process?

Response: Gather comments on the DEIS and provide responses. Note that comments and responses will be compiled as one document in the FEIS. Additionally, engineering will be continuing to refine the design in order to establish the proposed right of way. Additional studies will need to be completed including an interstate access document evaluating the connection of I-69 with I-465, the Engineers Report, refinements to the cost estimate, and continued public involvement including CAC-SWG meetings.

Question: Is INDOT going to fill or bridge the quarry pond?

Response: INDOT will likely fill the corner of the pond. INDOT will continue to refine the design in order to minimize costs and other impacts such as impacts to the Hanson Aggregates quarries on the north side of I-465.

Question: Will work on I-465 include reconstruction of the Mann Road interchange?

Response: No, work on I-465 will include added lanes but will not modify the Mann Road interchange.

Question: Will fill be from the pile of rubble at Hanson Aggregates?

Response: Fill material will be responsibility of the contractor.

V. Adjourn

Details discussed in this meeting are subject to change. This summary is a reflection of the status of these items at the close of the meeting.

These meeting minutes represent the understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments or revisions to the attention of Sarah Rubin at srubin@indot.in.gov

Note: This meeting summary documents ongoing, internal agency deliberations. Accordingly, the information contained in this summary is considered to be pre-decisional and deliberative.



MEETING MINUTES

Section 6 Community Advisory Committees (CAC)

Stakeholder Working Group (SWG)

Southland Community Church

Greenwood, Indiana

June 15, 2017 from 9:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.

Attendee	Organization
CAC / SWG	
Pat Andrews	Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations
Bob Babcock	Indiana Rail Company
Stephanie Belch	Indy MPO
Anne Bono	Bloomington Chamber of Commerce
Angela Caywood	Morgan County DFR
Tosha Daughtery	Visit Morgan County
Craig DeMott	City of Martinsville
Ryan Goodwin	Morgan County Commissioner
Justin Groenert	Southwest IN Chamber of Commerce
Jack Hubbard	South Central IN REMC
Mayor Shannon Kohl	City of Martinsville
Joe Krebsbach	Indianapolis Fire Department
Tana Lobb	Martinsville Redevelopment Commission
Michelle Moore	Martinsville School Corp.
Dana Monson	Johnson County Development Corporation
Steve Oschman	Greater Mooresville Advisory Committee
Jeremy Pell	White River Township Fire Department
Phil Probst	Morgan County Three Creeks Neighborhood Alliance
Ann Smith	Greater Greenwood Chamber of Commerce
Larry Smith	Morgan County Engineer
Jamie Thompson-Taylor	Martinsville Chamber of Commerce
Norman Voyles	Morgan County Commissioner
Julie Young	Town of Bargersville
I-69 Project Team	
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Jim Earl	INDOT
Andy Dietrick	INDOT
Kathy Eaton McKalip	INDOT
Laura Hilden	INDOT
LaMar Holliday	INDOT
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Eric Swickard	Lochmueller Group
Tim Miller	HNTB
Dave Pluckebaum	Corradino Group



I. Welcome and Introductions

Sarah Rubin (INDOT Project Manager) welcomed everyone and asked attendees to introduce themselves. She also discussed the meeting agenda.

II. Local Project Funding Guidance

Kathy Eaton-McKalip (INDOT Local Programs Director) gave a presentation regarding the Community Crossing funding program. The presentation included information summarizing the federal aid funding process for local communities. Information presented included type of eligible projects; the application process; actions required after the application process and additional information.

III. Pedestrian and Bicycle Connectivity

Jim Earl (INDOT Project Manager) presented Section 6 proposed pedestrian and bicycle connectivity criteria along Section 6. This included guidance requirements from INDOT using the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) criteria. The presentation included types of pedestrian connectivity (multi-use path, sidewalk, paved shoulder, shared streets); locations where each type of pedestrian connectivity will be utilized and typical cross sections.

Question: What criteria does INDOT use to assess safety?

Response: Considerations regarding the type of pedestrian connectivity are largely based on traffic forecasts.

Question: Were the locations of bicycle and pedestrian crossings determined by INDOT?

Response: Bicycle and pedestrian crossings locations were based existing conditions or approved local plans.

IV. Kitchen Table Meetings

Dave Pluckebaum (Corradino Group) provided information regarding Kitchen Table Meetings (KTM) for Section 6. These meetings are one on one discussions with property owners who are directly impacted by the project. The purpose of the KTM is to discuss the project with the property owner in a one-on-one environment and explain how the project will affect their property. In addition, the property owner can provide specific information about their property that can be shared with the designer for consideration in final design. Examples of information that property owners provide include septic tank locations, unknown property features, etc. INDOT anticipates conducting up to 800 KTMs as part of their proactive public involvement program. Dave provided contact information and encouraged meeting attendees to contact him with questions.



Question: Do you reach out to property owners or do they contact you?

Response: We contact property owners requesting an opportunity to meet. It is often difficult to obtain telephone numbers. Neighbors often contact us to provide information about individuals INDOT should meet with.

V. Draft EIS Comment Summary

Sarah Rubin provided an update regarding comments received on Section 6's Draft EIS. This included a breakdown of the types of comments and an explanation regarding how they will be addressed in Section 6's Final EIS.

VI. Project Status and Funding Update

Sarah Rubin provided an update regarding activities that have been completed since the last CAC/SWG meeting. She also discussed the overall project schedule for completion of Section 6's Final EIS / Record of Decision. This included activities related to the construction of the project. The project is still on schedule to obtain a Final Environmental Impact Statement/ Record of Decision in the first quarter of 2018.

Question: When will a decision be made regarding Southport Road?

Response: INDOT is evaluating feedback from comments regarding Southport Road. A decision is anticipated by the next CAC meeting.

Andy Dietrick (INDOT Communications) provided an update regarding project funding. INDOT anticipates identifying a funding source later this summer.

Question: Has a procurement method been identified for Section 6?

Response: No, a delivery method or procurement method has not been identified for Section 6.

Question: Will the priority ranking factor into the construction of the project?

Response: No, the priority of other INDOT projects will not factor into identifying how the project will be delivered.

Question: Will the project be segmented into two projects for construction?

Response: A determination regarding project segmentation has not been made yet. A potential schedule will be available later this summer.

VII. Topics to Discuss During the Next CAC/SWG Meeting

CAC/SWG members would like to discuss noise impacts and signage at the next meeting.



VIII. Adjourn

Details discussed in this meeting are subject to change. This summary is a reflection of the status of these items at the close of the meeting.

These meeting minutes represent the understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments or revisions to the attention of Sarah Rubin at srubin@indot.in.gov

Note: This meeting summary documents ongoing, internal agency deliberations. Accordingly, the information contained in this summary is considered to be pre-decisional and deliberative.



MEETING MINUTES

Section 6 Community Advisory Committees (CAC)

Stakeholder Working Group (SWG)

Southland Community Church

Greenwood, Indiana

September 12, 2017 from 9:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.

Attendee	Organization
CAC / SWG	
Terry Anderson	Martinsville Fire Department
Tosha Daughtery	Center Grove School Corporation
Justin Groenert	Evansville Chamber
Kenny Hale	Morgan County
Jason Holliday	Indianapolis City Council
Meredith Klekotta	City of Indianapolis
Joe Krebsbach	Indianapolis Fire Department
Anthony Krycka	City of Franklin
Bryan Lawrence	Morgan County Three Creeks Neighborhood Alliance
Shannon LeMaster	FSSA-Division of Family Resources
Bill Long	Center Grove School Corporation
Greg McKelfresh	South Central Indiana REMC
Dana Monson	Johnson County Development Corporation
Michelle Moore	Martinsville School Corporation
Jeremy Pell	White River Township Fire Department
Joe Tatternow	Morgan County - Parks and Rec
Jamie Thompson-Taylor	Martinsville Chamber of Commerce
Norman Voyles	Morgan County Commissioner
Ron West	Johnson County Commission
I-69 Project Team	
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Jim Earl	INDOT
Andy Dietrick	INDOT
Katie Rounds	INDOT
Laura Hilden	INDOT
LaMar Holliday	INDOT
Joe Bruno	INDOT-Indiana Logo Sign Program
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Tim Miller	HNTB
Christine Meador	HNTB
Jenifer Goins	HNTB



I. Welcome and Introductions

Sarah Rubin (INDOT Project Manager) welcomed everyone and asked attendees to introduce themselves. She also discussed the meeting agenda and shared a video from Commissioner McGuinness thanking CAC members for their participation.

II. Project Update and Public outreach

A. The public outreach efforts have included five meeting milestones at multiple locations and attracted more than 4,000 attendees. Additional public outreach activities included the project office, social media, and the email list serve.

III. Post-NEPA Outreach/Coordination

- A. INDOT will continue to hold meetings as requested
- B. As INDOT moves forward, outreach will be on a more individual and specific basis
- C. Project updates will continue to be shared via the list serve, social media, and quarterly newsletter

IV. Refined Preferred Alternative – Alternative C4 from the Draft EIS has been refined based on input from public, agencies, value engineering.

- A. I-69 from SR 39 to south of Smith Valley will have 4 lanes (2 in each direction)
- B. I-69 from south of Smith Valley to Southport will have 6 lanes (3 in each direction)
- C. I-69 from Southport to I-465 will have 8 lanes (4 in each direction)
- D. I-465 will have 8 lanes (4 in each direction) between Mann Road and US 31
- E. Project overview – A slide was shown explaining how to read the symbology on the maps.

V. The presentation walked through the project limits noting major changes between Alternative C4 and the Refined Preferred Alternative (RPA). Specific slides included:

- A. Southern project limits – No major refinements
- B. SR 39 Interchange – No major refinements
- C. Burton Lane – An overpass was included in C4. No overpass is included in the RPA. This change reduces costs and relocations. The Martinsville Baptist Tabernacle Church and School is no longer a potential relocation.
- D. Ohio Street interchange – C4 included a tight diamond with impacts to business and FEMA purchased property. RPA changed to include a tight diamond interchange with roundabout intersections. A local access extension of Mahalsville Road is added. These changes reduce business relocations and accommodates the proposed U.S. bike route.
- E. Grand Valley – The RPA maintains Birk Road intersection at current location to reduce number of relocations
- F. Artesian Avenue – The RPA constructs a roadway called Artesian Avenue from Mahalsville Road to Grand Valley Boulevard in lieu of extending Industrial Drive as shown in C4. This change reduces traffic through the industrial area, reduces relocations, provides more direct connection to commercial areas.



- G. Spring Valley and Sun Valley mobile home communities- RPA reduces relocations from 30 shown in C4 to one.
- H. SR 252/SR 44 interchanges – No major refinements
- I. Twin Branch Road – No major refinements
- J. Teeters Road overpass – No major refinements. Note access to golf course will be maintained.
- K. Myra Lane underpass – No major refinements
- L. Egbert Road overpass – Overpass shifted to avoid properties purchased with FEMA funds and access road within neighborhood revised
- M. Henderson Ford Road interchange – Interchange shifted to avoid wetland areas and stream west of Henderson Ford Road.
- N. Ennis Road – No major refinements
- O. Cragen Road – No major refinements
- P. Perry Road overpass – No major refinements
- Q. Old SR 37 – No major refinements
- R. Big Bend Road overpass – C4 included an overpass, RPA does not include overpass at Big Bend Road. It was eliminated due to public comments and a re-evaluation during the value engineering workshop.
- S. Waverly and Whiteland Roads – No major refinements. Overpass will be at Waverly Road.
- T. Banta Road - No major refinements
- U. SR 144 Interchange – C4 included a tight diamond interchange. RPA revised to include a partially folded diamond interchange to reduce the number of commercial impacts. A new connection between Huggin Hollow Road and Old SR 37 was added to eliminate mile long cul de sac. The access road east of I-69 is aligned to match with commercial development to southeast.
- V. Stones Crossing and Travis Roads – C4 included an overpass at Stone Crossing with impacts to Greenwood Mobile Home Community. The RPA does not include an overpass at Stones Crossing Road but does extend the access road east of I-69 from Travis Road to Stones Crossing Road resulting in less costs, one additional residential relocation east of I-69, and several fewer residential relocations at the Greenwood Mobile Home Community.
- W. Olive Branch Road – No major refinements
- X. Smith Valley Road to Fairview Road – The RPA changes ramp intersections to roundabouts and a roundabout is added at the Smith Valley and Mullinix intersection. The local access road west of I-69 is realigned to be closer to I-69 which reduces costs for utility relocation and reduces the size of the bridge over Honey Creek.
- Y. Fairview Road – No major refinements. The RPA adds a retaining wall on east side to avoid acquisition of CVS and neighboring businesses.
- Z. County Line Road interchange – No major refinements
- AA. Wicker Road underpass – No major refinements
- BB. Belmont Avenue - No major refinements
- CC. Southport Road interchange - Two alternatives were presented in the DEIS – C4a which impacted Aspen Lakes or C4b which impacted the commercial areas to the northwest. The RPA includes the a refined C4b which is less expensive and has less



residential relocations compared to C4a even though it does relocate more businesses. The RPA includes right of way in this area to accommodate drainage detention.

DD. Banta and Edgewood underpasses - No major refinements

EE. Epler underpass and ramps – no major refinements

FF. I-465 interchange – RPA tightens alignments of ramps to minimize size of bridges and reduce impacts to Hanson Aggregates on north side of I-465 by about 40 acres.

GG. I-465 bridge over White River – C4 including rehabilitation of existing bridge, but RPA includes replacement. The decision has not yet been made whether to widen existing piers or build fewer new piers.

HH. I-465 interchange at Mann Road – RPA includes a noise barrier from Mann Road to Mooresville Road on north side that was not part of C4.

II. I-465 and US 31 area – No major refinements

JJ. I-465 and Bluff Road area – RPA includes reconstructing I-465 approximately two feet higher than the existing I-465 to provide adequate vertical clearance on Bluff Road, Meridian Street, and Harding Street.

VI. What's Next?

A. Schedule – INDOT is still on schedule to publish a final EIS and Record of Decision in the first quarter of 2018. Construction will begin in Martinsville in FY 2020.

B. Project funding – Next Level Funding Plan – I-69 Section 6 received \$ 0.5 Billion

C. Kitchen table meetings – one-on-one meetings with property owners are underway in Martinsville

D. Pre-development Activities

1. Beam, Longest and Neff was recently selected to perform property acquisition services. Right of way acquisition activities will begin in earnest after the ROD.

2. Design Request for Proposal – Construction in Martinsville will be contracted as a traditional Design-Bid-Build contract. A request for proposal to select the design firm will be advertised today with the anticipation that the design firm will begin final design activities by the end of the year.

E. Safety is top priority

1. Survey, Geotech, and other field work will be on-going.

2. All field team members have an I-69 Section 6 ID badge.

3. If property owners are concerned about the authenticity of the ID, they should call the project office.

4. If property owners feel threatened, they should call local law enforcement.

5. INDOT will try to let everyone know where crews may be through social media and press releases.

F. Comment period – Provide comments on the refinements to the preferred alternative by September 29, 2017

VII. Signage, Noise and Lighting

A. Highway Signs

1. I-69 will be signed around the east side of I-465.



2. Signage around I-465 will be constructed as a separate construction contract.
3. Logo sign program - Indiana logo sign group
 - a. This program provides tourism and directional signs (TODs)
 - b. Logo sign program includes signs to attractions, lodging, dining, fuel, etc.
 - c. There will be limited space for signage between the SR 252 and SR 44 interchanges.
 - d. Community signage – Hospital, airport, etc. will be provided
 - e. Information on the signage program can be found at www.indianalogo.com
- B. Sound barriers
 1. A graphic of typical sound levels for various activities was reviewed.
 2. Sound barriers must be feasible and reasonable to be constructed. Additionally, they must be supported by the majority of the affected receivers and must be an effective noise deterrent at a reasonable cost per receiver.
 3. Reviewed potential locations for noise barriers and types of noise barriers.
 4. A sample of noise barrier was available to touch and feel at the meeting.
- C. Lighting – mostly at interchanges with different lighting effects depending on rural or urban area.

VIII. Questions

- A. Is INDOT working with the railroad regarding changing the grade of I-465?
 1. Yes, they have been invited to CAC, and INDOT will reach out to them during design.
- B. When is the timing to start discussions on logo signage?
 1. The best time to follow up is at the end of design and during construction.
- C. After the ROD, is there a way for locals to work alongside INDOT on design and construction for local road work to be incorporated into projects? Specifically thinking of access road at Smith Valley Road.
 1. There could be opportunities to partner depending on the work to be completed. Locals should coordinate proposed projects with INDOT. INDOT can then determine if there are opportunities.
- D. How do you recommend which way the route goes around I-465?
 1. Usually it is the closest or more direct route. If that results in additional roadway congestions then that roadway will be upgraded.
- E. When will maps be available?
 1. Maps will be available tonight on the INDOT web site and tomorrow in the project office.
- F. Is it accurate to say CAC is complete?
 1. Yes, INDOT will be moving into more individual discussions. There will be no more CAC meetings scheduled.
- G. How will maintenance of traffic be conducted?



1. Specifics of maintenance of traffic provisions are determined during final design. The contractors are to coordinate changes in access with business and residential property owners. Typically, there would be no pedestrian access during construction if no pedestrian access exists before construction. Access to businesses will be maintained during construction.

H. When do local governments advocate for aesthetics?

1. That is appropriate to complete during the design phase. Aesthetics is also a component of noise barrier meetings. Note that INDOT typically does not pay for the aesthetics, the expenses to build and maintain aesthetic treatments are typically born by the local governments.

IX. Adjourn

Details discussed in this meeting are subject to change. This summary is a reflection of the status of these items at the close of the meeting.

These meeting minutes represent the understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments or revisions to the attention of Sarah Rubin at srubin@indot.in.gov

Note: This meeting summary documents ongoing, internal agency deliberations. Accordingly, the information contained in this summary is considered to be pre-decisional and deliberative.