



TABLE OF CONTENTS

5.3 Land Use and Community Impacts5.3-1

5.3.1 Introduction 5.3-1

5.3.2 Methodology..... 5.3-2

5.3.3 Land Use and Zoning..... 5.3-3

5.3.4 Travel Patterns and Accessibility 5.3-7

5.3.5 Community Facilities and Services 5.3-7

5.3.6 Mitigation 5.3-23

5.3.7 Summary 5.3-25

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5.3-1: Direct and Indirect Land Use Impacts by Alternative 5.3-5



5.3 Land Use and Community Impacts

Since the publication of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), the calculations of acres of direct and indirect land use impacts have been updated to include the Refined Preferred Alternatives (RPA). This information is presented in **Table 5.3-1**.

Impact descriptions have been updated for all land use and community facilities and services to include the RPA. Comments provided on the DEIS that relate to land use and community facilities have been noted where appropriate.

5.3.1 Introduction

This section describes potential changes to land use and community resources resulting from I-69 Section 6. In most cases, conditions are reviewed within the socioeconomic study area or the survey study area. The socioeconomic study area is made up of selected census tract block groups or traffic analysis zones in Johnson, Marion, and Morgan counties, as defined in **Section 4.1** and illustrated in **Figure 4.1-1**. The discussion of indirect impacts also includes Hendricks County.¹ The socioeconomic study area is used to describe demographic and employment data.

As described in **Section 4.1**, the survey study area includes a one-mile buffer either side of the existing SR 37 center line. This area is useful for reviewing land use and community facilities near I-69 Section 6. Business and religious organizations within the survey study area were contacted and requested to complete the Business Survey.

Section 4.2 identifies the existing socioeconomic conditions in the I-69 Section 6 study area as a part of the description of environmental setting for the project. The information provided in **Section 4.2** establishes the basis for the evaluation of impacts presented in several sections of **Chapter 5, Environmental Consequences**, including this section.

The construction of a new interstate highway facility, whether on new terrain or through developed areas, affects the rate of growth and the land use development patterns of properties in the vicinity of the new highway. This section discusses anticipated land use changes due to I-69 Section 6. A full analysis of indirect and cumulative project impacts is provided in **Section 5.24**.

This section also discusses the impacts to community facilities and services such as schools, churches, hospitals, cemeteries, and emergency services. This chapter analyzes how the proposed project enhances or impedes the ability of the local population to make full use of community facilities and services.

¹ Generally, this chapter discusses direct impacts to land uses near I-69 Section 6 alternatives. These impacts are confined to Marion, Johnson, and Morgan counties. The scope for the discussion of indirect impacts extends to Hendricks County. See discussion of indirect land use impacts in **Section 5.3.2.1**.



5.3.2 Methodology

5.3.2.1 Land Use Impacts

The review of land use impacts, discussed in **Section 5.3.3**, identifies and quantifies the types of land use that would be acquired for right of way for construction of each of the I-69 Section 6 alternatives.

Direct Impacts

Direct impacts are defined by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations as “effects which are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place” (40 CFR §1508.8 (a)). The direct land use impacts of this project consist of land used for right of way for the alternatives. This impact was quantified by combining the proposed right of way for each alternative with the land use data layer in the project geographic information system (GIS). The land use data layer was based on an update of existing GIS-based resources and existing data from the Indiana Geological Survey. GIS updates included aerial photography interpretation, field review and coordination with expert land use panels. Within the I-69 Section 6 socioeconomic study area, seven general categories of land use are identified: developed land, agricultural land, upland habitat, open water, streams, wetlands, and mines/quarries.

Indirect Impacts

Indirect impacts are defined by the CEQ Regulations as “effects which are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable” (40 CFR §1508.8(b)). New highway access often spurs land use changes, such as new businesses/industries that create job opportunities that, in turn, attract employees to an area, spurring residential development. Development on these lands as a result of the proposed action is reasonably foreseeable in response to the project.

To identify where land use changes may be induced, maps of traffic analysis zones (TAZs) within Johnson, Marion, Hendricks, and Morgan counties were used as a tool to coordinate with the Expert Land Use Panel in each county. **Section 5.3.3.2** provides a summary of indirect land use changes, while the methodology and analysis is explained in greater detail in **Section 5.24**.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts include the direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action, combined with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions—whether or not caused by the project—in the same general geographic area (see 40 CFR §1508.7). Cumulative impacts on land use could result from development projects that are independent of the I-69 Section 6 project. **Section 5.24** presents a detailed discussion of both indirect and cumulative land use impacts, including the methodology for estimating those impacts.



5.3.2.2 Community Impacts

The evaluation of community impacts involves a review of trends and status of social and demographic characteristics for the State of Indiana; Johnson, Marion, and Morgan counties; and the I-69 Section 6 socioeconomic study area. The evaluation uses data from the 2010 United States Census, 2010-2014 American Community Survey², local planning agencies, and information obtained through an extensive public outreach program.

A field inventory of all such facilities in the socioeconomic study area was conducted to identify potential impacts of the project on local community facilities. These facilities include schools, colleges, universities, churches, cemeteries, libraries, public safety services (fire, police, and emergency service providers), hospitals, parks, recreational areas, bicycle facilities, pedestrian trails, utilities, and transportation facilities (roads, railroads, airports, and public transit). These are discussed in **Section 5.3.5**. While some of the identified community facilities are privately owned, all are available for public use. A review of GIS data comparing community facilities with potential right of way acquisitions and access changes provided the preliminary community impact analysis. Outreach to the public and potentially impacted community facilities was used to verify the GIS analysis and provide additional detail.

The background social and demographic data used in evaluating community impacts is provided in **Section 4.2**. The social impacts related to relocation of homes and businesses and potential impacts on community cohesion are described in **Section 5.2**. The public outreach program is discussed in detail in **Chapter 11, Comments, Coordination, and Public Involvement**.

Section 5.3.4 summarizes impacts to travel patterns and local access after I-69 Section 6 is constructed. **Section 5.12.2.8** discusses impacts during construction. Detailed analysis of traffic impacts after construction is completed is presented in **Section 5.6**.

Section 5.3.5 discusses post-construction impacts to community facilities within the socioeconomic study area. Coordination meetings were held to obtain information from fire, police, emergency service providers, schools, and churches regarding potential impacts (see **Appendix U** for emergency responder coordination and **Appendix I** for schools). A 22-question Business Needs Survey was sent to businesses within the survey study area. The survey study area includes the area within 1 mile from the center line of the existing SR 37 right of way. The survey results are provided in **Appendix A**.

5.3.3 Land Use and Zoning

As described in **Section 4.2.2**, the area surrounding I-69 Section 6 is addressed by a number of land use plans, zoning documents, transportation plans, and Metropolitan Planning Organization

² *The American Community Survey is an ongoing statistical survey by the U.S. Census Bureau. It regularly gathers information previously contained only in the long form of the decennial census, such as ancestry, educational attainment, income, language proficiency, migration, disability, employment, and housing characteristics.*



(MPO) Long-Range Plans. **Section 4.2.2.2** describes how these plans relate to SR 37 and/or the proposed development of I-69 Section 6. Local government jurisdictions enact zoning to advance adopted land use plans. **Section 5.2** identifies land use and relocations associated with I-69 Section 6 according to zoning land use categories.

Table 4.2-28 describes land use categories used in this study and summarizes the acreages of these land uses within the I-69 Section 6 field survey study area.³ The most prevalent classification is developed land, at 54 percent of the area. The 54 percent developed land can be broken down to SR 37 right of way (27 percent) and other developed land (27 percent).

Direct land use impacts have been estimated for each alternative by reviewing land use and right of way data. The total acres of direct impact include the right of way needs for the mainline, interchanges, grade separations, and local service roads. **Table 5.3-1** summarizes the estimated direct impacts or acreage within the proposed right of way in transportation use and in seven general land use categories for each alternative.

The **Human and Community Resources Map Series** provided in a separate tab at the end of this section shows direct land use impacts of the alternatives. Types of land use impacted are generally similar for alternatives, with well over half of the direct impacts occurring to developed lands. Up to half the right of way for I-69 Section 6 is already devoted to transportation use, at 924 acres for Alternative C1, 941 acres for Alternative C2, 921 acres for Alternative C3, 993 acres for Alternative C4, and 1,050 acres for the RPA.

New right of way (not in transportation use) would include primarily developed land, followed by upland habitat, agricultural land, and smaller areas of wetlands, water, and mines/quarries. New right of way required would be 999 acres for Alternative C1, 1,171 acres for Alternative C2, 945 acres for Alternative C3, 1,076 acres for Alternative C4, and 1,025 acres for the RPA.

The project could indirectly influence the location and timing of new developments, which would be driven by increased economic activity due to the project. This economic development would result in added homes and places of employment. Farmland or other undeveloped land could be converted to residential, highway-oriented commercial, or a mix of uses, particularly around new interchanges. **Table 5.24-2** provides detailed information regarding the locations and amounts of anticipated indirect land use changes as a result of induced growth, including increased households and jobs.

For the I-69 Section 6 study area, indirect impacts to agricultural lands would be approximately 207 acres for Alternative C2, and 209 acres for Alternatives C1, C3, C4, and the RPA. Indirect impacts to forest land are estimated at 63 acres for Alternatives C1, C3, C4, and the RPA. They are estimated to be 66 acres for Alternative C2.

³The field survey study area is a boundary that includes all alternative right of way footprints plus an approximate 50-foot buffer from these alternatives. The field survey study area is the area investigated for natural resources such as wetlands, streams, forests, and wildlife habitat. See **Section 4.1**.



Table 5.3-1: Direct and Indirect Land Use Impacts by Alternative

Types of Land Use	Total Land Area Required for Right of Way (Acres)				
	Alt C1	Alt C2	Alt C3	Alt C4	RPA
Right of Way					
Total Right of Way	1,923	2,112	1,866	2,069	2,075
Existing Public Right of Way	924	941	921	993	1,050
Required New Right of Way	999	1,171	945	1,076	1,025
Land Use					
Transportation (right of way not in other category) ^a	936	946	922	941	928
Developed Land	397	455	398	402	393
Agriculture Land	252	344	242	330	361
Upland Habitat ^b	244	253	202	332	355
Water - Open Water (Lakes, Ponds) ^c	47	22	17	18	3
Water - Streams ^d	13	15	14	13	3
Wetland Habitat - Aquatic Bed / Emergent / Forested /Scrub/Shrub ^e	5	10	9	4	4
Mines/Quarries ^e	29	67	62	66	17
Total – All Land Uses	1,923	2,112	1,866	2,106	2,075
Agricultural Land, Indirect Impacts by Year 2045 (54 to 55 TAZs) ^f	209	207	209	209	209
Forest Land, Indirect Impacts by Year 2045 (54 to 55 TAZs) ^f	63	66	63	63	63
Total Direct and Indirect Impacts Including existing right of way (rounded)	2,195	2,385	2,138	2,378	2,347
Total Direct and Indirect Impacts Excluding existing right of way (rounded)	1,271	1,444	1,217	1,385	1,297

(a) Includes all public right of way except where land in the right of way is in another land use category (i.e. wetlands, agriculture, forest, etc.).

(b) Source: **Table 5.4-6**. Includes non-wetland forest, herbaceous cover, and scrub/shrub areas.

(c) Source: **Table 5.19-2**.

(d) Source: **Table 5.19-2**. Wetland calculations for all alternatives have been updated based on more precise data available from wetland delineation performed after the DEIS was published.

(e) Source: **Table 5.15-1**.

(f) See **Table 5.24-8** for induced land use changes by alternative and land type. Whether an alternative includes an Ohio Street Interchange affects the number of TAZs experiencing induced growth.



Total direct and indirect impacts, including existing right of way, are estimated to be 2,195 acres for Alternative C1, 2,385 acres for Alternative C2, 2,138 acres for Alternative C3, 2,378 acres for Alternative C4, and 2,347 acres for the RPA. Total impact, excluding the existing right of way, are 1,271 acres for Alternative C1, 1,444 acres for Alternative C2, 1,217 acres for Alternative C3, 1,385 acres for Alternative C4, and 1,297 acres for the RPA.

As shown in **Table 5.3-1**, the estimated area of right of way required for I-69 Section 6 is the highest for Alternative C2 and lowest for Alternative C3. The required right of way for the RPA is lower than that shown for Alternative C4, the preferred alternative in the DEIS. Changes to Alternative C4 in defining the RPA are described in **Section 3.8**.

The RPA includes several local service road adjustments not included in Alternative C4, most notably the addition of Artesian Avenue in Martinsville. As described in **Section 3.8.2**, Artesian Avenue will extend west from Mahalassville Road, then curve north to access Grand Valley Center. This roadway will require additional right of way, but it avoids existing development and eliminates 11 commercial and five residential relocations shown for Alternative C4. This was one of many adjustments made in the RPA to reduce relocations, as described in **Section 3.8**. Other local service road adjustments made use of existing right of way of local roadways, resulting in a larger area right of way from areas of transportation use than the other alternatives.

The larger area of right of way for more local service roads in the RPA was offset by adjustments made to right of way lines throughout the corridor in the process of refining Alternative C4. The most notable reduction was in the area surrounding the I-465 interchange as design refinements were made to reduce the project footprint in the vicinity of existing quarries. Another refinement in the RPA that reduced a large area of right of way was north of Smith Valley Road, where the West Local Service Road was relocated next to the I-69 mainline to avoid the Center Grove Little League fields.

The right of way lines for the RPA were established taking property lines into consideration. Right of way for the RPA was set to match parcel boundaries identified in the County GIS system. Transportation land use for Alternatives C1 through C4 was estimated based on aerial images of the corridor.

Based on hydraulic analysis performed after the DEIS was published, the required right of way for ditches and detention areas is better defined in the RPA. Recognizing that several areas of the project corridor are susceptible to flooding, additional detail was developed to define the needs of the RPA in detail as a part of design refinement.

It should be noted that although the estimated total right of way need for the RPA is comparable or lower than the other alternatives, the number of relocations with the RPA is notably less. As a result of refinements in the RPA, there will be fewer residential, business, and total relocations required for the RPA than any of the alternatives defined for I-69 Section 6. Estimated relocations for the alternatives are summarized in **Table 5.2-5**.



5.3.4 Travel Patterns and Accessibility

Throughout the I-69 Section 6 public involvement process, accessibility has been one of the topics most often raised by local government officials, business owners, and residents. Access to the interstate highway and maintaining access to land within the I-69 Section 6 corridor have been highlighted as key factors in defining the alternatives for I-69 Section 6.

Care was taken in developing the alternatives to ensure properties would retain access to a public road. Existing access to developed property has been maintained with interchanges and new local service roads. Particular attention was paid to identifying and maintaining connectivity of emergency response routes. Collaboration with emergency responders will continue during design.

The location of interchanges and other access features (including grade separations, relocated, or closed local roads) could affect land use through changes in local travel patterns and accessibility. This is particularly important with local roads that currently have access to SR 37 but may not have direct access to I-69. Access to local properties with I-69 Section 6 alternatives is addressed in **Section 5.6.5**.

The ability to access parcels severed or split into more than one piece by the new road is also a consideration when evaluating local accessibility. While access to most severed parcels would be available via adjacent roads or new local service roads, some parcels would be landlocked. The decision whether to provide access to or acquire landlocked parcels, uneconomic remnants,⁴ and/or severed parcels may not be addressed until final design of the project. Since I-69 Section 6 involves conversion of existing SR 37, severed parcel impacts are minimal compared with new terrain I-69 sections.

5.3.5 Community Facilities and Services

This section identifies potential impacts to community facilities and related services. These include schools, churches and cemeteries, libraries, fire/police/emergency service providers, hospitals, parks and recreation areas, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and utilities/infrastructure. The **Human and Community Resources Map Series** provided at the end of **Section 5.2** show the location of these facilities/services within the project corridor.

Schools

Twenty public and private schools have been identified within a one-mile buffer area of SR 37 within the survey study area. A listing of these schools is provided in **Table 4.2-30**. Considering

⁴ An uneconomic remnant is that portion of a property remaining after acquisition, the retention of which provides little utility or economic benefit to the owner. In relation to farmland, an uneconomic remnant is a remainder that, if taken by itself, would be too small to be economically productive to farm. **Section 5.4** provides further discussion of uneconomic remnants related to farmland.



their proximity, these schools have the potential to be impacted by the completed project. These impacts might include different access routes, modified bus schedules, and increased communication and coordination requirements.

None of the 20 schools within one mile of SR 37 within the survey study area would require relocation with the RPA. Under all alternatives, including the RPA, a portion of the Martinsville High School property, located west of SR 37 between SR 252 and Ohio Street, would be acquired. Portions of the band practice field and grassy area around the school are needed for the Ohio Street interchange. Martinsville Baptist Tabernacle Christian School, a private school located at the northeast quadrant of the SR 37 and Burton Lane intersection would be completely acquired with Alternatives C2 and C4 for construction of a Burton Lane Overpass. This acquisition would be unnecessary with Alternatives C1, C3, and the RPA.

None of the remaining 18 schools would be directly affected by the project. These schools currently have access to SR 37 at existing cross streets. Future access to I-69 would be limited to interchanges, and access across I-69 would be provided by roadways with grade separations. As such, it is anticipated there would be impacts to school bus routes and changes in access patterns. Coordination with the affected school districts has been ongoing and would continue through final design and construction to minimize impacts to bus routes to the extent possible.

An open house was held on May 4, 2016, to obtain information from all schools in the survey study area. Representatives from these schools were invited to share information about the potential impact of I-69 Section 6 on their educational facilities and operations.

Representatives from the Martinsville Baptist Tabernacle Christian School noted concerns about the proximity of the I-69 Section 6 right of way to their campus and the potential for relocation. They were particularly concerned about the Burton Lane overpass included in Alternative C2, which would require relocation of their church and school. School representatives were also concerned about Alternative C1, which includes an elevated I-69 mainline and wall adjacent to their property. This alternative would not have direct impacts to the school but the elevated roadway and wall could negatively impact the view to and from the school and would require alterations to existing access to their property. Alternative C3 would not directly impact the school, but the lack of a Burton Lane overpass would result in longer access distances to the school from areas east of I-69. Alternative C4 (developed after the meeting with school representatives) would require relocation of the church and school.

During the comment period on the DEIS, some comments requested that the acquisition of the Martinsville Baptist Tabernacle Christian School be reconsidered. Because the RPA eliminates the Burton Lane overpass, there will be no direct impacts to the school. See **Volume III, Comments and Responses**, Part A, Public Comments - Individuals (PI) Section of this FEIS for comments and responses related to the Martinsville Baptist Tabernacle Church and School.

Representatives from the Metropolitan School District (MSD) of Martinsville shared various concerns regarding the alternatives. Impacts to the MSD of Martinsville include bisecting the school district, loss of parking lot area, changes in bus routes, and changes in access to their



facilities both for students and for operations. The following is a summary of their concerns and impacts associated with each alternative.

- MSD was concerned that I-69 Section 6 will bisect the school district. SR 37 currently acts as a barrier within the school district, as will I-69. Access across I-69 Section 6 would be maintained as it currently exists except at Burton Lane. All alternatives, including the RPA, would provide a new access point across the interstate at Grand Valley Boulevard just south of the high school. Alternative C2, Alternative C4, and the RPA would extend Grand Valley Boulevard to Cramertown Loop, which would provide additional connectivity compared to that which exists today.
- MSD was concerned about an underpass at Grand Valley Boulevard, the connection point for Grand Valley Boulevard, and access along Grand Valley Boulevard. Alternative C1 would provide an underpass at Grand Valley Boulevard, while all other alternatives would provide an overpass. All alternatives, including the RPA, would connect to South Street, which provides a link to Ohio Street. An interchange with I-69 at Ohio Street would be provided with Alternatives C1, C3, C4, and the RPA. Ohio Street would have a grade separation with Alternative C2. Sidewalks would be provided along Grand Valley Boulevard with all alternatives, including the RPA.
- MSD was concerned about loss of the high school parking lot south of York Street. All project alternatives would acquire a small amount of right of way from this lot to construct the Grand Valley Boulevard grade separation. Alternative C1 would have the least impact because Grand Valley Boulevard would remain at its existing elevation as it passes under I-69. Grand Valley Boulevard would pass over I-69 with the other alternatives. All alternatives, including the RPA, would preserve the integrity of the parking lot for use as a band practice field and for parking.
- MSD was concerned about access to the bus maintenance facility at the intersection of SR 39 and Rogers Road. Access would be maintained with all alternatives, including the RPA, although Alternative C1 would acquire a portion of this property and provide access to SR 39 from a new local service road to the northwest of the property. Alternatives C2, C3, C4, and the RPA would maintain access to Rogers Road. All alternatives, including the RPA, would provide access to I-69 at the SR 39 interchange.
- MSD was concerned with access to Jordan Road and Burton Lane due to flooding. Alternative C2 is the only alternative that would provide a new connection to Burton Lane. Alternatives C3 and the RPA would close Burton Lane at I-69. Burton Lane would remain open with Alternatives C1, C2 and C4.
- MSD was concerned with the safety of a new local service road to Twin Branch Road at SR 44. Alternatives C1, C2, C4, and the RPA would locate Twin Branch Road adjacent to I-69, while Alternative C3 would provide a local service road connection around the east side of Cikana Hatchery.
- MSD supports extensions of local service roads and increased connectivity of local roads associated with the Henderson Ford Road interchange. All alternatives, including the RPA, would connect Henderson Ford Road to Centennial Road. Alternatives C2, C4, and



the RPA would provide a local service road connection from the Henderson Ford Road interchange to New Harmony Road.

A representative of the Harrison Township Fire Department commented on potential impact to Waverly Elementary School indicating that Waverly Road access should be maintained as this is the most direct route to the school. This is consistent with the design of Alternative C2, Alternative C4, and the RPA.

School bus routes are evaluated yearly to adjust to changing student populations. Changes in access for school bus routes will be discussed with the school systems well in advance of when they take place so that the school systems can adjust routes in a timely manner. Where roads are severed, provisions for school bus turnarounds would be included during the final design phase of the project. Refer to **Chapter 3, Alternatives**, and **Section 5.6.5** for detailed information on local service roads, proposed overpass locations, road relocations and road closures associated with each alternative.

Available data and information suggest that the jurisdictional boundaries for schools would not be affected by I-69 section 6 for two reasons. First, no single neighborhood would have a relatively high number of residential displacements, so school boundaries would not need to be adjusted to compensate for a significant loss of school aged children. Secondly, there is no area of the project that is anticipated to induce growth to a degree that additional schools or an adjustment of boundaries would be needed.

Colleges and Universities

The project would improve access to a number of Indiana higher education institutions by reducing travel time and providing a safer and more reliable route for many trips. Students south of Indianapolis would have greater access to Indianapolis area campuses such as Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, Indiana University Medical School, Ivy Tech Community College, Central Indiana Region Campuses, Butler University, Marian University, Harrison College, and University of Indianapolis. Students north of the project area would realize a safer and timelier route when traveling south to the Indiana University Bloomington campus. Improved access between campuses could also help to foster instructional and research partnerships.

While no colleges or universities are located within the survey study area, completing the I-69 Section 6 project would improve regional access to colleges and universities throughout the region. A Tier 1 Core Goal (Goal 2 – Improve Personal Accessibility for Southwest Indiana Residents) had as one its performance measures changes in population within one hour of a major educational institution, defined as having an enrollment of at least 5,000 students. IUPUI, Ivy Tech (Indianapolis) and Indiana University were considered in calculating this performance measure.



Religious Facilities

Forty-nine religious facilities were identified within a one-mile buffer of SR 37 within the survey study area (see **Table 4.2-31**). The **Human and Community Resources Map Series** provided at the end of **Section 5.2** shows the locations of churches. These religious facilities are expected to rely on I-69 for access by some members of their congregations. Access patterns to religious facilities throughout Johnson, Marion, and Morgan counties could be affected by changes in access to or across SR 37.

Religious facilities within a one-mile buffer of SR 37 within the survey study area were provided the Business Needs Survey (see **Appendix A**). Representatives from the Martinsville Baptist Tabernacle Church also attended the school open house event held on May 4, 2016, as the Martinsville Tabernacle Christian School is operated by the church. Members of the First United Methodist Church met with project representatives numerous times regarding access to the church.

Martinsville Baptist Tabernacle Church, located at the Burton Lane and SR 37, has expressed concern about relocation and the access with I-69 Section 6. Martinsville Baptist Tabernacle is both a church and school. The impacts to the church and school are the same. These impacts are discussed with school impacts in this section.

The Faith Missionary Church is located north of Martinsville in the southeast quadrant of the SR 37 and SR 44 intersection. Access is provided by a private drive from SR 44. All alternatives, including the RPA, would require acquisition of some undeveloped church land along SR 44 in order to construct the SR 44 interchange with I-69. It is likely the church drive from SR 44 would be reconstructed with any alternative. No acquisition of church parking or structures would occur as a result of any of the alternatives.

The Prince of Peace Lutheran Church is located near the intersection of SR 37 and Morgan Street on the west side of SR 37. This facility includes a church, preschool, and daycare services. Direct access to this facility would be impacted by all alternatives, including the RPA, due to the closure of Morgan Street at I-69. An alternative route such as SR 44, Kristi Street, and Morgan Street would result in a one-mile longer trip than accessing the facility directly from SR 37.

INDOT provided a project update to the Prince of Peace Lutheran Church board members on May 12, 2016. Church board members expressed concern about the impacts to the church's parking and septic system. The alignment of Morgan Street with Alternative C2, Alternative C4, and the RPA would avoid acquisition of the church parking, but a portion of the church's septic field would be impacted. Alternatives C1 and C3 would impact the church's septic system and acquire more than half of their parking. Prince of Peace Lutheran Church submitted formal comments on the DEIS, citing concerns about impacts to the church's septic fields, existing water well, and driveway access. Two driveways will be provided as part of the I-69 Section 6 project, and INDOT has committed to addressing septic field and water well impacts during design. A potential solution is extending an existing sewer line along Morgan Street and connecting with the church. INDOT and the City of Martinsville are exploring this option.



Although this would require a lift station, it would allow the church to continue its operation. See **Volume III, Comments and Responses**, Part A, Public Comments - Individuals (PI) Section of this FEIS.

Martinsville First United Methodist Church is located in the northeast corner of SR 37 and Myra Lane. This facility includes a church, preschool and daycare services, and recreational spaces including a planned walking path. Direct access to this facility would be impacted by all alternatives, including the RPA, as Myra Lane access from SR 37 would be closed and Myra Lane would become a grade separated crossing of I-69. Access to the church would continue to be from Myra Lane with all alternatives, including the RPA.

Alternatives C1, C3, C4, and the RPA would maintain the existing driveway to the Martinsville First United Methodist Church from Myra Lane by providing a retaining wall at the existing SR 37 right of way line or by shifting the existing alignment to the west. Alternative C2 would impact the driveway and portions of the parking lot with a strip of right of way acquisition. A new driveway from Myra Lane to the church would be constructed east of the existing drive. This new driveway would impact stormwater treatment and retention basins along the existing driveway. With Alternatives C2 and C3, Myra Lane would be shifted south and would pass over I-69. With Alternative C1, Alternative C4, and the RPA, Myra Lane would remain in its existing location and would pass under I-69. First United Methodist Church submitted comment on the DEIS requesting that the Myra Lane grade separation be an overpass rather than underpass. The response to the comment notes that this would create potential safety issues, especially during inclement or icy weather. See **Volume III, Comments and Responses**, Part A, Public Comments - Individuals (PI) Section of this FEIS.

The Stones Crossing Church is located in the northeast quadrant of the SR 37 and Stones Crossing Road intersection. The church is accessed by a private drive on the north side of Stones Crossing Road. All alternatives except the RPA include a slight realignment of Stones Crossing Road in a southwesterly direction to accommodate the proposed grade separation of Stone Crossing at I-69. This small adjustment would require acquisition of a strip of undeveloped property fronting the road and would require limited realignment of the private drive. No acquisition of church parking or structures would occur as a result of any of the alternatives. One of the refinements made to Alternative C4 in developing the RPA was elimination of the Stones Crossing Road overpass, which eliminates direct impacts to the Stones Crossing Church. Access to the church from the existing local road network would be maintained.

The Southland Community Church is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of SR 37 and Smith Valley Road. Access is provided by two private drives on the north side of Smith Valley Road. The western drive is opposite Mullinex Road. The campus includes a church, nursery, and preschool facilities. Access to the church would be unchanged with any of the alternatives, although Smith Valley Road and Mullinex Road may experience increased traffic volumes. Smith Valley Road would be reconstructed within the project limits, which would require reconstruction of the west drive to the church and acquisition of some property adjacent to the road. No acquisition of church parking or structures would occur as a result of any of the alternatives.



The Mount Pleasant Christian Church and Community Center is located on the east side of SR 37, south and east of the Fairview Road intersection. The campus can be accessed from Bluff Road or Paddock Drive. Mount Pleasant Christian Church campus facilities include a church, nursery, preschool, and elementary school. None of the alternatives would have a direct impact on the church campus, although the lack of direct access to Fairview Road from I-69 with all the alternatives would increase travel time from some locations.

The Glens Valley United Methodist Church is located on the west side of SR 37 between Wicker Road and County Line Road, approximately 200 feet from the existing SR 37 right of way. Current access to the church is from Glens Valley Lane, which connects directly to SR 37. All project alternatives would close this access and provide a new access route from a proposed service road connecting the County Line Road interchange to Wicker Road. This proposed access is on the opposite side of the church and would require reconfiguration of circulation on the site. It may also impact auxiliary storage buildings and recreational green space on the site. No alternative would directly impact either the church building or parsonage located on the southwest corner of the property.

Cemeteries

Five cemeteries have the potential to be directly or indirectly impacted by the I-69 Section 6 project. These cemeteries are Wilson Family, Old Mount Olive Methodist, Bell, Williams Bradford, and Stockwell/Hammons/Cain. The location of these cemeteries is shown in the **Human and Community Resources Map Series** provided at the end of **Section 5.2**.

This project would be developed in accordance with Indiana Code regulating construction near cemeteries (IC 14-21-1-26.5 and IC 23-14-44-1). Where design plans require project construction within 100 feet of a burial ground or cemetery, a cemetery development plan will be completed and submitted to the IDNR Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (DHPA) during the design phase, per the Indiana Historic Preservation and Archaeology Law (IHPAA). The boundaries of two cemeteries, Bell Cemetery and Old Mount Olive Methodist Cemetery, are within 100 feet of the RPA and will require a cemetery development plan.⁵

Wilson Family Cemetery is located in a small clump of trees south of the Holiday Inn in Martinsville, south of SR 37 and west of Burton Lane. Access would remain available via Burton Lane. No direct impacts to the cemetery are anticipated with any of the alternatives.

Stockwell/Hammans/Cain Cemetery is located north of Martinsville near Martinsville Golf Course. The cemetery is in the woods southwest of the clubhouse. Access to the cemetery would

⁵ State law (IC 14-21-1-26.5) requires that any person planning to disturb the ground within 100 feet of a burial ground or cemetery for the purpose of erecting, altering, or repairing a structure must submit a development plan to the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (DHPA). This law does not prohibit construction near a cemetery, nor does it prohibit moving cemeteries if the proper permits are acquired. It only requires that developer plans take into account cemetery locations.



remain in place, and no direct impacts to the cemetery are anticipated with any of the alternatives.

Williams Bradford Cemetery is located near Henderson Ford Road, southeast of SR 37. None of the alternatives, including the RPA, would impact the cemetery. Although this portion of Henderson Ford Road would be closed at I-69 with all alternatives, including the RPA, the existing local road network would continue to provide access to the cemetery.

Old Mount Olive Methodist Cemetery is located west of SR 37, north of the Cragen Road intersection. This cemetery is associated with the former Mount Zion Church. Current access is provided by an access road to White River canoeing outfitters directly off of SR 37. This access point would be closed with any of the alternatives, and a new local service road would be provided on the west side of I-69.

Bell Cemetery is located north of Epler Avenue and east of SR 37. Alternative C1 would directly impact the cemetery, potentially requiring relocation of gravesites due to realignment of Epler Avenue. Alternative C2, Alternative C4, and the RPA would also realign Epler Avenue, but they would not require property acquisition from the cemetery. Alternative C3 would not realign Epler Avenue and there would be no impacts to the cemetery. The surrounding area is well developed, and access to the cemetery would be maintained.

Libraries

As noted in **Section 4.2.2.5**, there is one library located within the I-69 Section 6 survey study area. The Morgan County Public Library has a branch facility in the northwest quadrant of the SR 37 and SR 144 intersection. It is referred to as the Waverly Branch and has study/meeting rooms and internet access. Several comments were received after the publication of the DEIS emphasizing the importance of the library to the community. See **Volume III, Comments and Responses**, Part A, Public Comments - Individuals (PI) Section of this FEIS.

The Waverly Branch of the Morgan County Public Library would be relocated with Alternatives C1 and C3 due to the construction of a new SR 144 interchange. With Alternative C2, Alternative C4, and the RPA, steeper slopes with guardrail would be provided along SR 144 to allow the interchange to be constructed without directly impacting the library. Access to the library would be provided from Huggin Hollow Road, which would intersect with SR 144 west of the interchange.

Fire, Police, and Emergency Service Providers – Overall Comments

The I-69 Section 6 survey study area includes eleven fire, eight police, and one emergency service provider (see **Section 4.2.2.5** and **Table 4.2-32**).

The location of interchanges and local service roads including grade separations, relocations, or closing could affect fire, ambulance, and police responses. Changed travel patterns could produce longer trips and slower response times for emergency responders on some local routes.



Conversely, emergency responders would be able to reach major medical centers in Bloomington and Indianapolis more quickly because I-69 would provide a significant travel time savings compared with existing SR 37 (see **Table 3-1**).

INDOT is committed to continuing coordination regarding emergency response and law enforcement operations as the project progresses into final design, construction, and operation. The following section summarizes key issues identified through fire, ambulance, and police responder coordination. It also includes mitigation factors INDOT will consider as I-69 Section 6 development occurs.

A mutual aid agreement is in place among all Morgan County fire departments as well as the White River Township Fire Department in Johnson County that causes some departments to use SR 37. This agreement was established to provide assistance across jurisdictions when an individual department's capabilities are exceeded.

An open house was held on May 4, 2016, at the I-69 Section 6 INDOT Project Office in Waverly to provide project information and solicit input from fire, police, and emergency service providers. A summary of key comments provided by emergency responders and associated impacts follows.

Communication and Coordination

Emergency service providers indicated that they realize providing emergency services during and after the construction of I-69 Section 6 will be a challenge. They noted that effective and regular communication and coordination on construction activity, lane restrictions, and related matters is essential. Further, it was noted that construction information needs to be provided in a clear and understandable format to the public. Maps and diagrams, along with text narrative, would help people to better understand and utilize this information.

Departments noted the inherent value of their mutual aid agreements in effectively responding to incidents and that these relationships could be even more important in meeting emergency service provider needs during construction.

Increases in Traffic Volume

Emergency service providers realize that traffic volumes along SR 37 could increase prior to completion of I-69 Section 6 due to the completion of other I-69 Sections. They noted concern about the high volumes of traffic being directed through construction areas within I-69 Section 6, which could increase the number and severity of accidents. A related concern was the expected increase in the number of trucks that can both impede traffic movement and increase the severity of accidents.

Increase in traffic volume along I-69 Section 6 could create challenges to accessing accident locations in a timely manner. The reduction of access points along I-69 Section 6 is perceived as impeding timely access to accident locations.



Emergency service providers anticipate that possible increases in the number and severity of accidents may require that they upgrade their vehicles and equipment to respond adequately to these events. Smaller, rural emergency service providers will require additional training on how to effectively respond to accident events on an interstate highway with increased traffic volumes and speeds.

The construction activity associated with I-69 Section 6 could create delays for emergency service provider response. There is the potential for response delays to be mitigated by constructing strategic local service roads prior to beginning construction on the I-69 Section 6 mainline. The increased traffic volumes and delays associated with I-69 Section 6 construction could create challenges with transporting accident victims to trauma centers in Indianapolis.

Highway Design

Most emergency service providers noted that the higher functioning access features of I-69 Section 6 should provide safer emergency service provider access to incidents. The intersections, underpasses, and overpasses would provide safer access than many of the current at-grade crossings.

Concerns were noted about the design of I-69 Section 6 access ramps and their ability to accommodate the turning movements of top-heavy emergency service vehicles. Concerns were noted about the location, design, and construction of access doors within sound barrier walls to access water hydrants.

Based on feedback received, key issues are summarized in subsequent paragraphs from each respective fire, ambulance, and police entity. **Figure 4.2-6** identifies fire, ambulance, and hospitals/medical centers.

Fire and Emergency Service Providers – Specific Providers

Eleven fire departments and one additional emergency service provider are located within or immediately adjacent to the survey study area. They all require access to, from, or across SR 37. The eleven fire departments are shown on **Figure 4.2-6**. Fire departments with facilities or access that could be impacted are discussed below.

Washington Township Fire & Rescue

Washington Township Fire and Rescue is located north of Martinsville on the east side of the intersection of SR 37 and SR 44. Strip property acquisition along SR 44 would be required from the station to construct the interchange with all alternatives, including the RPA, but no impacts to the building or emergency response operations are anticipated. Washington Township Fire and Rescue requested direct access to Kristi drive from westbound Reuben Drive in order to reduce response times to the neighborhoods to the north of SR 44 and west of I-69. Based on this comment, this right turn movement is incorporated into all alternatives, including the RPA, except Alternative C1.



Harrison Township Fire Department

Harrison Township Fire Department is located along Waverly Road, just north of the Waverly Road and SR 37 intersection. It would not be impacted directly by any alternative. Access to the department's service area on the east side of SR 37 is via Waverly Road or Whiteland Road. Waverly Road would be an overpass in Alternative C2, Alternative C4, and the RPA with Whiteland Road closed. Whiteland Road would be an overpass in Alternatives C1 and C3, with Waverly Road closed. Department officials voiced support for alternatives that provide an overpass for Waverly Road over I-69. Officials noted that this would provide better response time to neighborhoods east of SR 37. They advised there would be little value to keep Whiteland Road open instead of Waverly Road since SR 144 can serve the same purpose as Whiteland Road. The RPA is consistent with these recommendations.

White River Township Fire Department

The White River Township Fire Department (WRTFD) has the greatest likelihood of being directly impacted by the project due to the location of its Fire Station #53 near the intersection of SR 37 and Smith Valley Road, which is proposed as an I-69 interchange with all alternatives, including the RPA. Alternative C2, Alternative C4, and the RPA would directly impact the building with construction of the northbound exit ramp from I-69 to Smith Valley Road, requiring relocation of the firehouse. Alternatives C1 and C3 would include a retaining wall adjacent to the exit ramp which would allow the building to remain, but would impact traffic circulation and operations of the firehouse.

Currently, fire apparatus enters the fire station from Mullinix Road and exits onto Smith Valley Road less than 200 feet east of its intersection with SR 37. The exit from the fire station to Smith Valley Road would be closed with all alternatives, including the RPA, due to the proximity of the entrance to the interchange. This closure would interrupt the flow of the emergency responders if the station were to remain in place, as with Alternatives C1 and C3. The fire station site circulation would need to be revised to allow all access to and from Mullinix Road. This would adversely affect the functionality and response times of the fire station.

The WRTFD indicated that the change of circulation patterns and the anticipated increased traffic volumes associated with the I-69 Section 6 alternatives could delay responding to an emergency incident. The WRTFD indicated that the relocation of its Fire Station # 53 at 850 S. Mullinix Road to a parcel along Morgantown Road would allow it to provide more effective emergency service provider services. In the event that a relocation is necessary, the WRTFD has indicated that the Morgantown Road location would be a suitable replacement site.

The WRTFD submitted comments on each of the alternatives after the DEIS was published. The WRTFD concurred with the selection of Alternative C4 as the DEIS preferred alternative, which provides for the relocation of Fire Station #53. The RPA is nearly identical to Alternative C4 at this location, and it also requires that Fire Station #53 be relocated. See **Volume III, Comments and Responses**, Part A, Local Government (LG) Section of this FEIS.



Indianapolis Fire Department Station #66

Indianapolis Fire Department Station #66 is located near the intersection of SR 37 and Edgewood Avenue. The fire department facility is immediately east of the project area. None of the alternatives directly impact this station. The Indianapolis Fire Department noted the importance of the proposed Edgewood Avenue underpass to its emergency response to the west side of I-69. This underpass is included in Alternatives C1, Alternative C4, and the RPA. Edgewood Avenue would be closed at I-69 in Alternatives C2 and C3.

Police Departments – Specific Providers

Eight police departments are within or immediately adjacent to the survey study area. No police departments have facilities that would be directly impacted by I-69 Section 6. Coordination with police departments as well as other emergency responders has been conducted to discuss emergency response times. Local service roads have been included to accommodate police and emergency access and maintain response times.

Hospitals

As noted in **Section 4.2** and as shown in **Figure 4.2-6**, one hospital is situated within the I-69 Section 6 survey study area. Indiana University Health Morgan Hospital in Martinsville is in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of SR 37 and SR 252. It would not be directly impacted by the project. Access to Morgan Hospital from SR 37 is presently available from SR 252 or Hospital Drive. All project alternatives include an interchange at Hospital Drive, which would speed response times to many locations with construction of I-69 Section 6.

Parks and Recreation Areas

Johnson, Marion, and Morgan counties offer a variety of public parks and recreation areas. **Section 4.2.2.5** describes existing and planned park and recreation areas within or adjacent to the survey study area. Parks and recreational areas that may be impacted by the project are discussed below.

Martinsville Golf Club

Martinsville Golf Club is an 18-hole privately owned golf course open to the public. It is located north of Martinsville, with the eastern boundary located approximately 400 feet west of SR 37. Access to the golf course is from Teeters Road. All project alternatives include an extension of Morgan Street from the south through the Martinsville Golf Club property, and all alternatives, including the RPA, would displace the driving range located between the clubhouse and SR 37 along Teeters Road. A portion of a cart path and one tee, just north of the clubhouse, would also be displaced in all I-69 Section 6 alternatives. Access to the golf club would remain from Teeters Road, which would be reconstructed to pass over I-69 and intersect with the extension of Morgan Street.



Cikana State Fish Hatchery

The Cikana State Fish Hatchery is a publicly owned facility, as described in **Section 4.3**. All alternatives, including the RPA, would impact property in the north unit of the facility. This includes the triangular-shaped portion west of SR 37 (not used by the hatchery) and portions of the west and north sides of the hatchery. **Table 5.22-1** shows impacts of 2.9 acres with Alternative C1, 3.2 acres with Alternative C2, 1.1 acres with Alternative C3, 3.2 acres with Alternative C4, and 3.6 acres with the RPA. Impacts include forested land west of SR 37 and along the west side of the property east of SR 37. Impacts would also include portions of three fishery ponds on the north end of the property south of Teeters Road. None of the alternatives would require the relocation of any structures on the property.

All alternatives, including the RPA, would provide a cul-de-sac at Twin Branch Road at the south end of the north unit which would provide access to the property. Alternatives C1, C2, C4, and the RPA include a new local service road immediately east of I-69 Section 6 that would connect Twin Branch Road to Old SR 44. Alternative C3 would provide a local service road further to the east that would connect Twin Branch Road to SR 44. The current access via Teeters Road along the north side of the property would be removed with the construction of a grade separation at that location.

In its comments on the DEIS, the Indiana Department of Natural Resources supported access provided to the Cikana Fish Hatchery as provided by the new local service road connecting Twin Branch Road to SR 44. See **Volume III, Comments and Responses**, Part A, State Agencies (AS) Section of this FEIS.

Alternative C3 would also impact the Cikana State Fish Hatchery east unit. Alternative C3 would include a local service road from SR 44 that would curve around the east side of the east unit to connect to Twin Branch Road. Alternative C3 would impact approximately 0.4 acre of the east unit. None of the other alternatives would impact the east unit.

White River Henderson Ford Bridge Public Access Site

The White River Henderson Ford Bridge Public Access Site is located approximately 4.5 miles north of Martinsville and 0.7 mile north of SR 37 on Henderson Ford Road (IDNR (5), 2016). The public access site provides opportunities for recreational activities on the White River, such as canoeing, kayaking, and fishing. The public access site would not be directly impacted by the project. Access would be improved with the direct access to I-69 at the Henderson Ford Road interchange.

The privately-owned Center Grove Little League baseball diamonds are located northwest of the SR 37 and Smith Valley Road intersection and southwest of Honey Creek. The park includes nine baseball diamonds, parking and concession stands. These facilities are adjacent to the existing SR 37 right of way. The largest baseball field and the smallest baseball field located at the north end of the facility would be directly impacted by a new local service road with Alternatives C2 and C4. They would not be impacted by Alternative C1, Alternative C3, or the



RPA. The Center Grove Little League submitted a comment on the DEIS, requesting more information on the impacts of the project to its facility. One of the refinements made to Alternative C4 in developing the RPA was the realignment of the new local service road further east to parallel I-69. With this adjustment, the RPA would have no impacts to these baseball fields. See **Volume III, Comments and Responses**, Part A, Public Comments - Organizations (PO) Section of this FEIS.

Lake Haven Retreat (Kamper Korner)

Lake Haven Retreat, also known as Kamper Korner, is a privately owned 22-acre recreational vehicle campground located on the east side of SR 37 at its intersection with Edgewood Avenue. The campground provides a five-acre stocked lake used for fishing, recreational vehicle camping sites, tent camping sites, an event hall, and paddle boat rental. Lake Haven Retreat is privately owned (Lake Haven Retreat, 2016). The property would be directly impacted by all project alternatives due to acquisition of property along SR 37.

All alternatives, including the RPA, would require acquisition of the western portion of the campground, impacting at least 40 campsites. The campground is currently screened from SR 37 by a vegetated fencerow which would be removed with all alternatives, including the RPA. The eastern portion of the campground would not be directly impacted but would have visual impacts due to the loss of the vegetative screening and increased noise impacts due to higher traffic volumes on I-69.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Section 4.2.2.5 describes existing trails within or near the project area. These facilities are shown in **Figure 4.2-4**. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities which may be impacted by the project are listed below. In several cases, the project design would accommodate existing or planned trails.

Martinsville Bike-Pedestrian Bypass

The *Morgan County Parks and Recreation 2015-2019 Master Plan* recommends a Martinsville Bike-Pedestrian Bypass for I-69 that utilizes and upgrades rights of way of existing county roads and city streets, in combination with some new right of way to create a bicycle and pedestrian trail. This proposed trail does not cross or intersect I-69 Section 6 and would not be impacted. Coordination with Morgan County will be ongoing throughout project design to accommodate future plans for this trail to the extent practical.

US Bicycle Route 235 (Martinsville Proposed)

The US Bicycle Route System is a national cycling network established by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) in 1978. AASHTO approved INDOT's applications for three Indiana routes in 2015, including USBR 35 from Michigan to Kentucky. These designated bicycle routes utilize existing roads and trails. USBR 235 is a proposed "bypass" route that would leave Indianapolis on Mann Road and pass through



Morgan County to Bloomington before linking with USBR 35 near Columbus. INDOT staff met with local groups in Martinsville to discuss the proposal and learned of plans to cross I-69 at Burton Lane. The Burton Lane overpass is not included in the RPA. INDOT will work with local groups to make provisions for at an alternate location to accommodate USBR 235 at I-69.

White River Greenway (Morgan County Planned)

The White River Greenway Trail has not yet been constructed within the I-69 Section 6 survey study area but is planned in both Morgan and Marion counties. The *Morgan County Parks and Recreation 2015-2019 Master Plan* and the *Morgan County Comprehensive Plan* acknowledge plans for I-69 and include a proposed White River Greenway west of SR 37 along the White River, from the Morgan/Johnson County line to Henderson Ford Road. The vision for the White River Greenway is to create a multi-use greenway corridor that will parallel the White River. The plan indicates a single area of concern regarding I-69 Section 6, a location near Cragen Road and the White River. The plan recommends a bridge crossing of the White River linking the proposed greenway with the southeastern part of Morgan County.

Most the planned greenway is to be located west of SR 37, near the White River. However, plans show connectivity to areas near the I-69 Section 6 project area. These would be greenway spurs to provide access from populated areas. Coordination with Morgan County will be ongoing throughout project design to accommodate plans for this trail to the extent practical.

White River Greenway (Marion County)

The White River Greenway is one of the original trails in the Indy Greenways system. It currently extends from the Indianapolis Museum of Art at 38th Street, through downtown Indianapolis at White River State Park, to connect with the Fall Creek Trail at Raymond Street.

The *Indy Greenways Master Plan* (May 2014)⁶ includes the extension of the White River Greenway Trail to Southwestway park, including a segment along the White River under the I-465 bridge within the I-69 Section 6 survey study area. The I-69 Section 6 project would replace these I-465 bridges. This bridge work is not anticipated to affect future trail construction under the bridges. Coordination with the Indy Parks Greenways will be ongoing during project design to accommodate plans for this trail to the extent practical.

Little Buck Creek Greenway (Indianapolis Planned)

The Little Buck Creek Greenway is currently comprised of a 0.40-mile section and a 0.54-mile section between Mann Road and Bluff Road along the north side of Little Buck Creek, just north of and parallel to Southport Road. The existing Little Buck Creek Greenway is not continuous through the I-69 Section 6 project area as it stops approximately 550 feet east of SR 37 and 1,300 feet west of SR 37. The Little Buck Creek Greenway was included in the 2002 *Indianapolis*

⁶ <https://indygreenwaysmasterplan.wordpress.com/full-circle-master-plan-2/>



Greenways Master plan as a 4-mile trail between Mann Road and Bluff Road, including a crossing of SR 37. The *Indy Greenways Master Plan* (May 2014) extended the planned trail west to the White River Greenway near Southwestway Park and east to the planned Buck Creek Trail near Southeastway Park, a distance of 18.3 miles.

This section of the trail is proposed to provide connectivity across SR 37. This trail connection was considered in the planning of bridges across Little Buck Creek in all I-69 section 6 alternatives, including the RPA. Funding has not been identified for construction and an implementation timetable has not been established. Coordination with Indy Parks Greenways will be ongoing throughout project design to accommodate future plans for this trail.

US Bicycle Route 50 (Southport Road)

The US Bicycle Route System, designated through recommendation by each state DOT and approved by AASHTO has mapped US Bicycle Route 50 from Illinois to Ohio. The section of USBR 50 through Indianapolis follows Southport Road at SR 37. The Indianapolis Department of Parks and Recreation provided a letter of support for the route. As part of I-69 Section 6 project design, provisions will be made along Southport Road to accommodate the bicycle route through the interchange.

Utilities

When SR 37 is replaced by I-69 Section 6, utilities may be required to relocate all or portions of their facilities out of the proposed limited access right of way. These features typically include gas transmission lines, fiber optic conduits, water lines, sewer lines, and some electrical transmission lines. **Section 4.2.2.5** describes utility services and potential areas of impact within the I-69 Section 6 project area.

Utility facilities that cross the limited access right of way may be required to make adjustments to the crossing. Depending on the facility type, this may involve changes to the location and type of overhead poles for electric/cable/telecom lines. Adjustments to gas and water facilities may involve the relocation of valves or encasement of the lines. Stormwater and wastewater facilities may need to relocate existing manholes or change the length of the pipes, necessitating changes in pipe size and grade.

Coordination with utilities is ongoing to accommodate their facilities in the design of I-69 Section 6. Considering that most utility infrastructure is installed under the ground, identifying specific locations will require considerable effort on the part of the utilities if locations are not already mapped. Mapped utilities were reviewed as part of this study, but precise identification of their locations and conflicts is deferred to the design phase of project development. Development of utility relocation plans and review of easements to determine responsibility for relocation costs will be a part of future engineering design phases.

Extensive coordination with utility companies is already underway to support planning by the utility companies and the project team. In many instances, interim or temporary services may be



put in place while permanent utility relocations are constructed. Utility relocations may also create an opportunity for a utility company to consider related improvements that would update their facilities and improve their level of service. Future project design and phasing will require advance notice and coordination with utility providers to maintain construction schedules and minimize service interruptions.

Transportation Facilities and Services

Section 4.2.2.5 describes the primary transportation facilities and services in the socioeconomic study area, including local and state roadways, railroads, airports, and transit. Impacts to the roadway system are described in **Chapter 3, Alternatives** and **Section 5.6**, which reviews traffic impacts of I-69 Section 6. There are no direct impacts to airports or transit with any of the I-69 Section 6 alternatives, although a tall structure permit may be required during construction since portions of the project at or near I-465 are in the approach to Runway 14-32 at Indianapolis International Airport.

Indiana Rail Road Company tracks pass under I-465 approximately 2,700 feet east of the Harding Street interchange. Existing clearance of the two I-465 bridges above this railroad are approximately 23 feet (22.75 feet for eastbound and 23.08 feet for westbound) according to inspection records. All I-69 Section 6 alternatives include additional lanes on I-465, which require widening or replacing the I-465 bridges over the railroad. Coordination with the railroad will occur during design and construction, and minimum bridge clearance requirements of 23 feet over the railroad as required by the Indiana Design Manual will be observed.

5.3.6 Mitigation

I-69 Section 6 right of way consists primarily of developed land, forest, and farmland. The I-69 Section 6 corridor also includes numerous community resources. Measures to mitigate the potential impacts on land use patterns are described below. A summary listing of proposed mitigation measures for all impacts is provided in **Chapter 7, Mitigation and Commitments**.

5.3.6.1 Community Planning Program

A commitment was made in Tier 1 to develop a Community Planning Program (CPP) for the I-69 project. The program was developed to establish a regional strategy by providing resources to local communities to manage development growth associated with I-69. The program provided grants to local communities (cities, towns, and counties) to prepare land use plans, transportation plans, zoning and subdivision ordinances, special highway corridor “overlay zones” or other local planning initiatives to manage new developments or to stimulate economic growth along the I-69 corridor. **Section 7.2** describes the I-69 Community Planning Program in detail.

The I-69 CPP was a two-phase effort. Phase 1 activities included developing community planning tools, preparing regional planning and economic development strategies for the entire I-



69 corridor area, and establishing the framework for the Phase 2 program. The Phase 2 program provided grants of up to \$50,000 for communities to develop planning programs to capture the economic benefits and manage associated growth in a way to protect sensitive environmental resources which potentially could be impacted by development induced by the I-69 project. Neighboring communities could apply for joint grants. For example, the joint grant for Martinsville, Mooresville, and Morgan County totaled \$150,000.

These grants totaled \$1,500,000 for the entire Evansville-to-Indianapolis corridor. Five communities in the vicinity of I-69 Section 6 were eligible to apply for I-69 CPP grants. The City of Martinsville, Town of Mooresville, and Morgan County opted to team together in their planning efforts and used the grant to develop the SR 37/SR 144 Corridor Plan (2010), comprehensive plan updates for Morgan County and Martinsville, and a comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance update for Mooresville. Johnson County and Greenwood received \$100,000 to develop a new comprehensive plan that framed challenges and opportunities associated with I-69. The City of Indianapolis elected not to pursue a planning initiative. All community planning grants were awarded in 2007 and 2008. This Tier 1 commitment has been fully satisfied.

5.3.6.2 Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS)

CSS is a collaborative, interdisciplinary approach that involves stakeholders to develop a transportation facility that fits its physical setting and preserves scenic, aesthetic, historic, and environmental resources, while maintaining safety and mobility. CSS considers the total context within which a transportation improvement project will exist.

To design and construct a freeway that is sensitive to the environment through which it will be traversing, FHWA and INDOT would seek the continued assistance from the communities near the corridor through Tier 2 design and construction phases of the project.

Early in Tier 2, INDOT and FHWA worked with the local officials, MPOs, and others to identify representatives from neighborhood groups, emergency response personnel, schools, local advocacy groups, etc., to be members of each Community Advisory Committee (CAC). For I-69 Section 6, an additional group consisting of local government representatives was established as a Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) to provide input and early data exchange similar to the CACs and reviewing agencies.

The specific outcome of CSS depends, in part, on input from the CACs, participating agencies, and the public. The use of CSS may result or has resulted in the following modifications to the alternatives.

- Generally constraining all alternatives, including the RPA, to the general SR 37 location and elevation to reduce overall impacts and traffic disruptions.
- Use of existing transportation right of way, pavement, and infrastructure where appropriate by utilizing minimal impact design criteria to maximize return on capital investments.



- Improving aesthetics of the highway by planting native wildflowers, minimizing riprap on side slopes and in ditches and using attractive structures (e.g., bridges, retaining walls, signs, etc.). There is also community interest in gateway treatments for the Martinsville approaches. INDOT has committed to CSS measures, which may include plantings, gateways, and other enhancements within constraints of available right of way, impacts, and cost, as further discussed with the city and county agencies during final design.
- Reconnection of existing local service roads in lieu of increased residential, business, and farm impacts associated with construction of new local service roads immediately adjacent to I-69.
- Design consideration for accommodating bicycle and pedestrian traffic at new interchanges, and further consideration of these accommodations where existing infrastructure is reused, as appropriate.

5.3.7 Summary

Direct land use impacts, outside the right of way of SR 37 and local roadways, include 999 acres for Alternative C1, 1,171 acres for Alternative C2, 945 acres for Alternative C3, 1,076 acres for Alternative C4, and 1,025 acres for the RPA. Existing transportation right of way used would be 924 acres for Alternative C1, 941 acres for Alternative C2, 921 acres for Alternative C3, 993 acres for Alternative C4, and 1,050 acres for the RPA. The area of total estimated right of way for the RPA is comparable to the other alternatives and is lower than Alternative C4. Refinements in the RPA include local service road adjustments and greater precision in defining property lines, utilities, and drainage features, as explained in **Section 5.3.3**. It should be noted that the RPA has fewer residential, business, and total relocations than any other alternative, as summarized in **Table 5.2-5**.

The Martinsville Baptist Tabernacle Christian School campus would be relocated with Alternatives C2 and C4. The elevated roadway and wall with Alternative C1 would change the view to and from the school and change the access to the property. Alternative C3 and the RPA would not directly impact the school, but would close Burton Lane at I-69, which would make access to the school less direct for some trips. One of the refinements made to Alternative C4 in developing the RPA was elimination of the Burton Lane overpass, which eliminates direct impacts to the Martinsville Baptist Tabernacle Christian School.

A strip right of way would be acquired with any of the alternatives from Martinsville High School, impacting a parking lot and an adjacent open field. The functionality of the parking lot for use as a practice field for the band and parking would be maintained.

A strip of right of way would be acquired from the Martinsville School District bus maintenance facility with Alternative C1 and access would be altered with a new access road. All other alternatives would maintain access to Rogers Road. All alternatives, including the RPA, would provide access to I-69 at the SR 39 interchange.



The Morgan County Public Library Waverly Branch facility in the northwest quadrant of SR 37 and SR 144 intersection would be relocated with Alternatives C1 and C3 due to the construction of a new SR 144 interchange. With Alternative C2, Alternative C4, and the RPA, steeper slopes with guardrail would be provided along SR 144 to allow the interchange to be constructed without directly impacting the library.

Many churches within the survey study area currently rely on SR 37 for access, which could change as a result of I-69 development. Five churches have the potential to be directly impacted by the project, including Martinsville Baptist Tabernacle Church, First Church of Nazarene, Prince of Peace Lutheran Church, First United Methodist Church, and Glens Valley United Methodist Church. As noted above, Alternative C4 was modified in developing the RPA to eliminate the Burton Lane overpass, which avoids direct impacts to the Martinsville Baptist Tabernacle Church.

The project is in close proximity to five cemeteries—Wilson Family, Old Mount Olive Methodist, Bell, Williams Bradford, and Stockwell/Hammons/Cain. Olive Cemetery and Bell Cemetery are within 100 feet of the RPA construction limits, and will require the submittal of a cemetery plan to the Indiana Department of Historic Preservation during project design.

The only hospital in the I-69 Section 6 corridor is Indiana University Health Morgan Hospital in Martinsville, located near the intersection of SR 37 and SR 252. It is not anticipated to be directly impacted by the project. All alternatives, including the RPA, provide an interchange at SR 252/Hospital Road to provide access at the same location as existing SR 37.

Among the many parks, recreation areas, and pedestrian/bicycle facilities in the vicinity of the I-69 Section 6 project, the Cikana State Fish Hatchery, Center Grove Little League Baseball Diamonds, and Lake Haven Retreat (Kamper Korner) facilities are closest to the project. Modifications made to Alternative C4 to define the RPA avoid impacts to the Center Grove Little League Baseball Diamonds. The other two facilities would be impacted to some degree in all alternatives, including the RPA.

Public utility facilities have been field located or identified through contact with various utility companies. Utility relocation plans are a function of final design, which means coordination with utility companies involved in this phase of the project would continue during the final design phase of the project.

None of the alternatives would result in direct impacts for transit and airports in I-69 Section 6 project area. All alternatives, including the RPA, are expected to directly impact Indiana Rail Road Company facilities during project construction due to widening or replacement of the I-465 bridges over its tracks east of Harding Street.