



I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies

Section 5 CAC Summary

Location: Section 5 Project Office One City Centre - 1st Floor conference room

Date/Time: March 22, 2005, 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Subject: Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting # 2

Participants: See attachment

Introductions and Initial Discussions:

The meeting began at approximately 6:00 p.m. Everyone attending introduced themselves and stated the group or organization they were representing. Wendy Vachet (WV) briefly reviewed the first CAC meeting, which was held in November 2004, and the purpose of the CAC. WV discussed the goals of the current meeting regarding baseline landuse and mobility.

The key goal is to gather as much baseline data as possible to assist with modeling validation (traffic and landuse) and help determine access points to I-69. In addition to CAC input, Section 5 will utilize an Expert Land Use Panel, made up of several local experts from planning, engineering and real estate segments, who will meet several times during the next few months and look intensively at current and future predicted land use. This makes the model input data as accurate as possible. Updated current and future land use maps will then be presented at the next CAC meeting.

WV also provided a brief update on historic properties research, which has been on-going in Section 5. Many local historians and sources of information have been consulted, and a draft Historic Properties Report detailing initial features in the Section 5 area is in progress.

Regarding the development of Alternatives, WV noted that the access alternative (3C) developed in Tier 1 will be considered, as well as several other options. All alternatives will be refined and provided on preliminary maps during the next couple of months. A public information meeting will be held sometime in the summer of 2005 to present these alternatives.

WV mentioned that FHWA has desired interchange spacing guidelines: one mile in urban areas, three miles in rural areas. While there may be possible arguments for certain access points that do not specifically follow these guidelines, the guidelines will have significant influence on the acceptable interchange points, and thus should be kept in mind by CAC members while working on tonight's exercises. However, WV encouraged CAC members to provide such arguments in favor of specific interchanges, as they saw appropriate.

A question was asked regarding overlap between Sections 4 & 5 – how can interchanges in Section 5 be considered without knowing the exact location of the interchange with Section 4? WV acknowledged that this is an on-going issue, but that the two Section consultants have been collaborating and will reach a workable conclusion so that alternative development and analysis can move forward. CAC representatives were encouraged to discuss what they thought would be best for the overlap area during the exercise.



I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies

Agenda Item 1- Workshop Exercises:

Mary Keith Floyd (MF) briefly discussed the instructions for the workshop portion of the CAC meeting and members began the exercise.

Participants broke into three groups. Each group would spend 20 minutes at one of three stations along the Section 5 corridor. At the end of the 20 minutes, each group would rotate to the next station, until each group had been to all three stations.

At each station, participants looked at aerial photo plots enhanced with GIS information showing basic current and future planned land use features. They were asked to provide any corrections to what they saw on the maps, so that new maps would incorporate the changes.

Participants were asked to consider mobility and access needs for 2030, and what they thought might be important issues based on their particular points of views (e.g., neighborhood access, commercial access, bicycle/pedestrian access, etc.) They were asked to evaluate all current access points either as interchanges, over/underpasses, or no direct access (i.e., access to I-69 via frontage road only). To assist with visualizing the size and shape (and possibly direct impacts) of interchanges, celluloid cutouts were provided to lay over various potential interchange points.

Participants were also asked to “rate” each potential access point, over/underpass and non-access point from 1-5 (1 being the least desirable/necessary, and 5 being the most desirable/necessary).

Agenda Item 2- Workshop Results Summary:

Significant comments were provided on several possible interchange points and overpass/underpass locations. Specific ideas included:

That Road & Rockport Road

- Several participants considered That Road a better location than Rockport Road for an overpass than an interchange, especially in conjunction with an interchange at Fullerton Pike

Fullerton Pike:

- Considered by many to be a good place for an interchange (better than Tapp Road) to facilitate east/west to growing areas; however, a connection with Gordon Pike is considered essential.

Tapp Road

- Considered by some to be a better location for an interchange than Fullerton Pike because of current traffic and east/west connections, and also for future development.
- Emergency Medical Service (EMS) would prefer a Fullerton interchange over Tapp, if given a choice between the two.
- A bicycle underpass is desired

Bloomfield/SR 45 (2nd Street)

- The current interchange is acceptable, most considered it valuable to keep as it is, or modify if necessary for traffic.

Whitehall/3rd Street

- The current interchange is acceptable, most considered it valuable to keep as it is, or modify if necessary for traffic.



I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies

Vernal Pike

- Considered a very important east/west route, particularly for industrial and commercial traffic
- Considered dangerous and difficult to maneuver in current status
- Most stated an interchange would not be necessary, but an under or overpass would be essential.
- Many stated an underpass with a realignment of 17th Street might be preferred due to topography
- A bike tunnel would be preferred, due to traffic, and cyclists would like to see a tie-in to 17th Street

SR 46

- Current interchange should be kept
- Bike/pedestrian access or retrofit is desired, possibly all the way to Ellettsville

Arlington Road

- Current overpass is considered appropriate
- Bike access should be added

Acuff Road

- Interchange is considered appropriate either at Acuff or Kinser, but is needed at least at one location
- Interchange not needed for emergency/police access
- Topography and floodplain issues would make it difficult to build an interchange
- Most considered over/underpass appropriate provide school access
- Bicycle access to over/underpass is desired
- East/west access required for EMS vehicles

Kinser Pike

- Interchange considered appropriate either a Acuff of Kinser
- Access to high school is considered important
- EMS access needed due to future industrial/commercial development
- Interchange not considered necessary for Hoosier Energy access
- At least an under/overpass is considered necessary for cyclists

Walnut Street / Bottom Road

- Several different opinions were expressed regarding this potential interchange point. Some stated that an Interchange is necessary because this is the “Gateway to Bloomington;” others stated that the lack of an interchange at this specific point would not really affect this concept – it could just as well apply to another interchange.
- The entire area is in a floodplain, and thus development will be difficult and restricted
- At least an overpass was considered appropriate.
- If kept as an interchange, access to Ellettsville is desired.

Wylie Road/Showers Road

- Most considered an interchange undesired here.
- The terrain is very steep and there is no current or planned development in surrounding area
- Floodplains exist to the east and west
- Some stated there is no need for an over/underpass because there is no continuation of Wylie to the west; however, others stated Wylie could be extended to the west, and thus an over/underpass could be useful here.
- Access at least to a frontage road is considered crucial



I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies

Sample Road / Wayport Road

- Many considered this to be an appropriate location for an interchange due to the need for direct north/south access; however, concern was expressed for high direct impacts
- EMS access considered important here
- Future residential development expected to the west
- Considered a good access point for Windsor Estates, Oliver Winery, and Worms Way
- Access for Ellettsville should be considered

Crossover Road / Chambers Pike

- Considered an important access point for Poynter Metals and the Hoosier Energy substation
- Could be a useful interchange between Sample and further north (e.g. Paragon Road)
- At least an over/underpass is considered important, with access to a frontage road
- An underpass might be better due to terrain

Cooksey Lane / Turkey Track Road

- At least a frontage road connection is necessary here
- Some stated that an overpass would be desirable

Agenda Item 3- Wrap-up:

Following the exercises, WV asked for feedback. WV noted that the project team only received one comment after the CAC meeting – and as such Pepsi products are now provided as refreshment in addition to Coke products. Several comments suggested that the exercises were useful in allowing CAC members to present information, and to gain information to provide to the groups they represent.

A question was asked about how to accomplish distribution of information from the CAC. Suggestions included distribution of meeting materials and minutes and posting of information on community group websites.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

The discussions described in this summary provide a meeting overview and do not create an obligation or commitment for final project decisions.

This meeting summary represents the project team's understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments to the project manager's attention, Wendy Vachet.



I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies

Attachment
Section 5 CAC Meeting # 2 Attendance
March 22, 2005

CAC Member Organization	Representative
Tom Micuda	City of Bloomington Planning Dept./MPO
Bob Cowell	Monroe County Planning Department
Paul Tedesco	Bloomington Chamber of Commerce
Gary Shelley	Bloomington Economic Development Corp.
Kathy Smith	Bloomington Bicycle Club
Jeff Barlow	Bloomington Fire Department
Mick Renneisen	Bloomington Parks and Recreation
Randy Williamson	Bloomington Police Department
Kriste Lindberg	Indiana Karst Conservancy
Richard Wilk	Showers Neighborhood Association
Mike Hefron	Maple Grove Neighborhood Association
Jim Lingvai	Windsor Estates Neighborhood Association
Mike Rampley	Hoosier Energy
Frank Nierzwicki	Town of Ellettsville
Susie Graham	Bloomington Board of Realtors

Project Team	Representative
Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT)	Eric Swickard
Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, INC (BLA) <i>Project Management Consultant for corridor (PMC)</i>	Jonna Stack, Nicole Minton
Michael Baker, Jr., Inc. (Baker) <i>Project Management for Section 5</i>	Wendy Vachet, Mary Keith Floyd, Kurt Weiss, Stephanie Collier, Mark McElwain, Brian Curtis, Jim Peyton, Damion Purfrey