



MEETING NOTES

7550 South Meridian Street, Suite B * Indianapolis IN 46217 (317) 881-6408 * Fax: (317) 917-5211

Meeting Location: Section 6 Project Office
7550 South Meridian St., Ste. B
Indianapolis, Indiana 46217

Project: I-69 Tier 2 EIS
Section 6

Meeting Date/Time: Monday, November 8, 2004
6:00 pm to 8:00 pm

Subject: Section 6 Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #1

Participants:

Project Team:

FHWA: Anthony DeSimone
INDOT: Lyle Sadler
PMC: Jonna Stack, Doug Davidoff, Jim Dittoe,
Section 6: Tim Miller, Brock Hoegh, Bill Wiedelman, Matti McCormick, Tony Carpenter, Kwame Awauh, Dave Hunter

CAC Members in Attendance:

Pat Andrews	Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations
Jerry Dunn (Alternate)	Center Grove School Corporation
Bill Peeples	Johnson County Department of Planning & Zoning
Kathleen Peterson	Sunshine Gardens Neighborhood Association
Jim Crose (Alternate)	Center United Methodist Church/The Living Well Church (Future)
Darren Jaynes (Alternate)	Indiana Land Resources Council
Mike Bagley (Alternate)	Perry Township Schools
Louis Zickler	Real Estate & Community Development Advisors
Cheryl Fidler	Indiana Farm Bureau

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION DATE	ACTION BY
1.	<p>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS</p> <p>a. Tim Miller opened the meeting by welcoming the members of the I-69 Community Advisory Committee (CAC). He asked each member of the CAC and the Program Management Consultant team to provide a self-introduction.</p>		

MEETING NOTES

2.

MEETING PURPOSE/PROTOCOL

- a. Tim Miller provided an overview of the meeting's purpose, indicating that Tier 1 was complete and that the approved Corridor has been selected. He defined the scope of this group's responsibility in Tier 2 and referenced the Section 6 maps to describe the Section 6 project corridor as one of six segments within the project corridor. He indicated that this group would serve as a working advisory group to the Section 6 Consultant team. Tim referenced the importance of this group as a vehicle to outreach and understand the public's interest in this project. Administratively, Tim asked that those present as a CAC member alternate provide a written letter from the original invitee indicating his or her recommendation of the alternate's participation for INDOT's consideration.
- b. Tim introduced Matti McCormick as the Section 6 Public Involvement Lead and Meeting Facilitator. Matti thanked the participants for their commitment of time to this effort. She indicated that the composition of the group includes representatives of diverse stakeholders with local, community, environmental, economic, safety, infrastructure and agricultural interests.
- c. Matti stated that this meeting would have two objectives 1) to serve as an introductory meeting to introduce the project based on the current scope for Tier 2 and 2) to provide the opportunity for CAC members to define and prioritize the interests of the community stakeholders. Matti defined this meeting as an opportunity for open dialogue, recognizing that her most important role would be to listen and facilitate discussion that captures the comments of the participants. She shared that the end product of this meeting would be a subject roster for future discussion topics at CAC meetings. She indicated that the overarching role of the CAC, as defined by Tim, would be to serve as an advisory group to the Section 6 Team. Functionally, she referenced that the CAC would serve to channel information and public perspectives, to, and receive information from the Section team. She referenced that the CAC would be a vehicle to provide a broader understanding of the community and neighborhoods within the corridor. She indicated that one of the most important components of tonight's meeting would be the opportunity to provide the project team the opportunity to understand the interests of the corridor stakeholders.
- d. Matti indicated that a group discussion would be the format of tonight's meeting. She referenced that writers present would capture participant comments and she invited each member to be fully engaged. She indicated that the group discussion would define community interest and views including human and natural environments. She asked the members to open their binders and she referenced the materials provided. She indicated that the binder was an important work tool and should be brought to each meeting. She asked that subsequent meeting summaries and materials be added to the binders as the CAC meetings progressed. She indicated that a questionnaire regarding future meeting options was contained in the binder and should be returned via mail. She referenced that the binder contained information about each of the project offices, detailed information about the Tier 2 Studies and information about the purpose of a CAC, as defined by INDOT.

MEETING NOTES

MEETING PURPOSE/PROTOCOL CONTINUED

- e. Matti stated that with the conclusion of Tier 1, the 3C Corridor has been selected for additional analysis. She indicated that the group is now focused on the Tier 2 Studies, which will be executed in 18-36 months. During that time, Matti indicated that the Section 6 project team will work to define the specific and final alignment for Section 6 within the proposed corridor.

3. PROJECT BACKGROUND

- a. Tim Miller reinforced that this group would focus on the Tier 2 Studies and would not discuss the results of Tier 1, recognizing that the preferred corridor selection had been made and was not the focus of Tier 2. He gave a brief overview of the project corridor, indicating that the overall project is 142 miles long between Evansville and Indianapolis and that this group is responsible for Section 6 only, which encompasses the area between SR 39 in Martinsville to I-465 in Indianapolis. In addition, he asked the CAC members to recognize that the Section 6 CAC is responsible for those interests in Johnson and Marion counties only, though if the CAC members had any interests to share in Morgan County, those comments were welcomed.
- b. Tim indicated that Section 6, which begins at SR 39 in Martinsville and ends at I-465 in Indianapolis, is 26 miles in length. He indicated that this stretch of the corridor will make use of the existing four-lane SR 37, except near I-465. He noted that the location and configurations of any proposed interchanges will be studied during this phase of the project. He also shared that the project team is meeting with local planning officials in Marion, Johnson and Morgan counties, that the project team is evaluating traffic patterns along SR 37 to assist in the determination of interchange and overpass locations, and, that the I-465/SR37 interchange is being evaluated for potential new interchange concepts.
- c. Tim noted that key issues for Section 6 include interchange locations and design, access to abutting properties and residences, and location of grade separations with intersecting roads. He indicated that the Section 6 Team will continue studying these issues along with environmental issues such as creek crossings, forests, wetlands, and floodplains.
- d. Tim indicated that, as in the Tier 1 process, public involvement for Tier 2 will be an on-going effort that will include information meetings, community advisory committees, a project website, and a public hearing. In addition, the Section 6 project office will be open daily to provide current information and receive public input. He indicated that more than 250 people have visited the project office for information. Tim introduced Matti McCormick as the Public Involvement Lead for Section 6 to lead the group discussion.

4. GROUP DISCUSSION

- a. Matti indicated that in the first half of the meeting, the project team presented an overview of the project with project background and meeting protocol, now in the second phase of the meeting, the project team would write down interests and listen to the CAC members in reference to their interests and views relative to Tier 2.

MEETING NOTES

GROUP DISCUSSION (CONTINUED)

- b. Matti McCormick stated that communication protocol for the CAC only allows for comments from CAC members. She indicated that the project team would remain after the close of the meeting to answer any questions from the observing public in attendance. She reiterated that alternates in attendance would need to provide written referral of their recommendations for participation to INDOT for INDOT's consideration of their respective participation. Matti opened the floor for comment from the CAC members.
- c. MCANA requested clarification of the current status of route selection. The Indiana Department of Transportation indicated that the current Corridor is approved and will stand as submitted in the Tier 1 Study.
- d. MCANA and Sunshine Gardens asked if other neighborhood groups had been considered. Matti McCormick responded that the team made initial selections based on a cross section of representation including neighborhood groups within the corridor. Matti and Tim indicated that the team would be open to consideration of other neighborhood participants consistent with established CAC selection protocol.
- e. Sunshine Gardens indicated that given the potential impacts, the project is a very emotional for many people. Matti shared that the team appreciated the importance of community and neighborhood and that her emotion was sincerely appreciated. Tim Miller stated that the team recognizes the sensitivity of the project and appreciated representation from Sunshine Gardens.
- f. There was a comment made about the continued viability of commercial development given the uncertainty of the proposed route of planned development. Tim Miller indicated that Tier 2 was scheduled for 18-36 months and that the team recognizes the timing concerns of final decisions within the corridor.
- g. The Lumina Foundation asked about the timing of future CAC meetings. Tim shared that CAC meetings are tentatively proposed on a quarterly basis. He indicated that alternate scheduling would be considered based on the preference of the group, and given the information flow that might be required.
- h. MCANA asked if the Perry Township Fire Department would be represented. Matti shared that the Fire Department is an invited CAC member.
- i. There was a comment made concerning the funding mechanism. Tim Miller indicated that both federal and state funds would most likely be utilized for the project, at 80% federal, 20% state and that detailed funding questions could be best answered by INDOT representatives. He mentioned the desire to stay focused on local issues related to alignment alternatives.

MEETING NOTES

GROUP DISCUSSION (CONTINUED)

- j. Matti asked the group to share their comments, ideas and suggestions for the Section 6 team to consider during the development of the project. CAC members provided the following topics:
1. Affect on neighborhoods.
 2. Affect on planned commercial development.
 3. Disconnecting neighborhoods.
 4. Opposition to the plan.
 5. Emergency responder access to neighborhoods.
 6. Environmental issues (Potential Impact on water quality/air quality/aquifer).
 7. Future development opportunities (Missed) by delayed 18-36 month timeline.
 8. Business relocation (Job losses).
 9. The uncertainty of real estate value impacts.
 10. East/West access (Isolation)
 11. Timeline? (Critical to commercial development).
 12. Potential tax base (Commercial to offset loss in residential tax base? Are we reducing?)
 13. Potential Traffic Congestion impact on local roads?
 14. Construction – Starting location? Costs?
 15. Benefits? (What are they and how does this consider the neighborhoods?)
 12. Interchange locations (Will they affect access? When will final decisions be made?).
 13. Affects to primary/secondary arterials along SR 37.
 14. Sunshine Gardens area (Isolating community, loss of community, loss of access by kids, constriction by evolving highway design).
 15. Bike/pedestrian pathways affected.
 16. Neighborhood boundaries (Existing and created by the highway) limit opportunities for access.
 17. Appearance/design and locations of interchanges (Neighborhood impact, loss of neighborhoods).
 18. How will intersection changes affect traffic flow?
 19. Will lifestyle/recreational changes be needed for kids?
 20. Information exchange with the public?
 21. Proposed construction schedule.
 22. Inabilities to sell homes in the corridor until decisions are made.

MEETING NOTES

5.

SUMMARY

- a. Matti restated that this meeting's purpose was defined as having two purposes, 1.) to introduce the project and, 2.) to engage the participants in defining the interests relative to this project. She indicated that the defined purpose had been met, with comments received, she summarized the comments in the following subject clusters, transportation access for schools, neighborhoods and emergency responders; neighborhood isolation; delays in commercial development and subsequent potential loss of tax base; and reduced neighborhood development/loss of community. In follow-up to this meeting, she indicated that these comments would be presented to the Section 6 Team and Project Management Team, with topics defined for future CAC meetings.
- b. She thanked the attendees for their participation.

6.

OTHER ISSUES/DISCUSSION

- a. Tim Miller restated the objective of the Tier 2 Studies and indicated that subsequent meetings would address the interests referenced. He thanked the participants and adjourned the meeting.

Attachment(s):

- a. Meeting #1 Attendees. (see attachment)



MEETING NOTES

MARION/JOHNSON COUNTY Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #1 Organization Attendees November 8, 2004

The following organizations/agencies were represented:

1. Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations
2. Center Grove School Corporation
3. Johnson County Department of Planning & Zoning
4. Sunshine Gardens Neighborhood Association
5. Center United Methodist Church (Southern Dunes)
6. Indiana Land Resources Council
7. Perry Township Schools
8. Indiana Farm Bureau
9. Perry Township
10. Department of Public Works