



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: July 19, 2005, 6-8 p.m.

Subject: Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting # 3

Participants: See attachment

The meeting began at approximately 6:00 p.m. Wendy Vachet (WV) introduced members of the Section 5 Project Team and briefly described the display materials and handouts. She explained that the materials represented the culmination of the past 14 months of environmental and engineering studies in Section 5, and would be the same materials presented at the Public Information Meeting to be held the next evening (July 20th) at Liberty Church in Martinsville, Indiana.

Boards shown to the CAC members included:

- Alternative Access Plan Maps (1 set of boards for each of three alternatives)
- Conceptual Typical Sections graphics
- Access Alternative Comparison Table
- “Ways to Submit Comments”

Handout “Packet” provided to the CAC members included:

- Alternative Access Plan Maps (three tiger-based maps, 1 for each alternative)
- Comment Survey form (with access plan comparison comment form)

WV advised members to comment in as much detail as they could and mail or return the forms to the project office. She indicated CAC comments would be invaluable in getting to the next stage of narrowing down the alternatives.

WV noted that the following were significant considerations during alternative development: avoidance of historic properties/districts and cemeteries; maintaining access at 2nd St., 3rd St., and SR 46; providing appropriate frontage/access roads; and limiting potential impacts to certain features such as superfund sites and floodplains.

WV described some general features of the alternatives presented. All three alternatives are generally broken down into three areas: “Urban,” “Transition,” and “Rural.” WV noted that Alternative 1 basically shows the interchange points developed in the Tier 1 study with the addition of access plan details (frontage roads, etc.). She also described the conceptual typical section graphic (urban, urban collector-distributor, and rural), and the Collector-Distributor (CD) concept.

WV explained that none of the alternatives show an interchange at Vernal Pike; however, either an overpass or an underpass will be considered and that Acuff Road will be either no direct access, an overpass, or a frontage road.

WV also described the various options associated with Kinser Pike and Walnut St./SR 37 (ability to have one or the other as an intersection, but not both). She noted that the options showing a Kinser Pike interchange would not really use existing Kinser Pike, but would be a shift of the current Walnut connection to the south.



I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies

WV pointed out that all of the alternatives show the northbound lane of existing SR 37 as an access road starting at Sample road north to either Chambers Pike or Paragon Road.

CAC members were asked to spend as much time as possible examining the provided materials, visit the office if additional clarification was needed, and to encourage the members of their representative groups to visit the office. WV indicated they should attempt to provide comments as soon as possible.

WV asked if members had any preliminary questions.

A CAC member asked about how floodplain impacts could be mitigated, particularly at Walnut St. WV responded that this was being carefully considered – an interchange would have a much bigger impact than just expansion of the mainline and that permitting would need to be considered in some areas.

A CAC member asked about traffic in relation to travel lanes, particularly in the urban section. WV said models are being generated, but analysis of specific alternatives has not yet been finished; she added that traffic analysis would definitely be used in evaluating alternatives and access plans. A CAC member asked what the traffic design level of service (LOS) was for the project. Brian Curtis said that for Rural areas the LOS will be B and for Urban areas the desirable is B and the minimum is set to C.

A CAC member asked about environmental impacts. WV indicated the goal is to minimize impacts as much as possible. She added that the interchanges shown on the current maps are intentionally large in order to establish a “worst case” scenario, and they will be contracted where possible based on additional analysis; thus, further impact avoidance and/or minimization is likely. Jim Peyton pointed out that all alternatives would be designed to avoid drainage impacts to the two superfund site’s (Lemon Lane and Bennetts Dump) groundwater recharge areas since the water is either undergoing active treatment or evaluation of remedial alternatives.

WV added that drainage will be an important design consideration throughout the Section 5 corridor.

Following the discussion, CAC members dispersed to view the maps and other materials and to discuss specific questions with Section 5 team members .

The meeting ended at approximately 7:45 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 # 3 Attendance
July 19, 2005

CAC Member Organization	Representative
City of Bloomington Planning Dept./MPO	Tom Micuda
North Kinser Point Neighborhood Assoc.	Linda Thompson
Bloomington Bicycle Club	Kathy Smith
South Central CAP	Matt Wysocki
Maple Grove Neighborhood Association	Jennifer Hubbard
Windsor Estates Neighborhood Association	Jim Lingvai
Hoosier Energy	Mike Rampley
Town of Ellettsville	Frank Nierzwicki
Bloomington Board of Realtors	Susie Graham

Project Team	Representative
Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT)	Eric Swickard
Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, INC (BLA) <i>Project Management Consultant (PMC) for I-69 Tier 2 Studies</i>	Jim Dittoe 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