



## MEETING SUMMARY

**Meeting Date:** December 2, 2004  
**Summary Date:** December 14, 2004  
**Meeting Location:** Library, Eastern Greene School  
**Purpose of Meeting:** Section 4 Community Advisory Committee Meeting

**Attendees:** See Attachment

### Introduction

Bruce Hudson, Section 4 Project Manger, opened the meeting by explaining the general role of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC). It was noted that the CAC will have the opportunity to look more closely at Tier 2 issues as compared to the broad scale of the Tier 1 public involvement. CAC members will be able to voice and discuss Section 4 issues that are important to the group they represent.

CAC members introduced themselves and the groups they represent. Project team members introduced themselves and explained their role in the project. The project team consists of FHWA, INDOT, BLA and their subconsultants (project management consultant – PMC for all six sections of the corridor), and DLZ and their subconsultants (project managers for Section 4).

CAC members were informed that their role is valuable to this process as an advisory group sharing local interests with the project team and sharing project information with the members of the groups they represent. The Federal Highway Administration and INDOT maintain ultimate authority over project decisions.

CAC members were each provided with a CAC binder for their group. It includes project background information and should be used to store future meeting agendas, summaries and handouts. Information on each CAC member, any alternates, and their respective groups are also included in the binder. CAC members should bring their binders to future meetings.

A sheet for CAC contact information was distributed for completion by the CAC members. CAC members were asked if they would like the CAC roster to include their contact information for sharing with other CAC members. CAC members should indicate on their information sheets if they do or do not want to share their contact information.

Summaries of the CAC meetings will be provided by DLZ approximately one week after the meetings. These summaries will become public record and will be included in the appendix to the Tier 2 Studies, Section 4 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

If CAC members find it necessary to designate an alternate for their group, they must provide the contact information for the alternate to the Section 4 office for approval prior to any CAC meetings. In order to ensure continuity of the CAC, the project team asked that membership be kept to one alternate for each group.

Section 4 Project Office  
3802 Industrial Boulevard – Suite 2  
Bloomington, IN 47403  
Phone: 812-334-8869 Fax: 812-334-2370

If any CAC members feel there are groups not currently represented on the CAC that should be, they should notify the project office.

It was decided that Thursdays at 6:30 PM is a good time to conduct future meetings. There were no objections to meeting at the Eastern Greene High School library.

Bruce Hudson noted that the CAC is meant to provide the organizations an opportunity to become closely involved with community issues associated to the project. The role of the project team is to facilitate the meetings and to provide resource information. It was noted that avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of project effects will be three important points discussed often at CAC meetings. Input will be sought from the CAC on these points.

DLZ will provide experts at future meetings to discuss specific issues of interest to the CAC such as a landscape architect to discuss possible aesthetic enhancements along the highway. Context sensitive solutions will also be a future topic of discussion for the CAC.

One committee member interested in roadside improvements such as bicycle paths asked if an expert on the Federal Transportation Enhancement Program could attend a future meeting. A FHWA representative responded that if the CAC members would like to have this type of expert at a meeting it could be arranged.

## **Presentations**

Brian Arterbery, Deputy Project Manager for Section 4, gave an overview of what was considered and decided in the Tier 1 Study and a preview of the Tier 2 Studies. It was noted that the purpose and need for a direct highway between Indianapolis and Evansville was set by the Tier 1 Record of Decision (ROD) and that Alternate 3C was selected for its high performance on the three core purpose and need goals. CAC members were informed that detailed field studies of the 3C corridor are currently underway as part of the Tier 2 Studies. The project team's goal for Section 4 is to complete the studies and obtain a ROD in approximately 30 months. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation by Brian Arterbery was provided to the CAC members.

Bruce Hudson emphasized that the CAC will focus on Tier 2 issues. He also indicated that the project team is working closely with federal and state resource agencies. He noted that by law some project information must be kept confidential, however, members can be assured that such information is being carefully examined by the appropriate agencies.

One member asked if there is any possibility of considering an alignment outside of the selected 3C corridor. It was explained that the Tier 1 ROD determined that the Section 4 alignment will be located within the 3C corridor but offers the ability to look outside the selected corridor, if necessary.

Another member asked what will happen if a resource is encountered along the 3C corridor during the Tier 2 Studies that makes placing an alignment there impossible. This question was asked relative to possible Tier 2 findings and how such findings could effect Tier 1 decisions. An FHWA representative explained that the Tier 1 ROD selected alternate 3C but that the ROD does allow for consideration of alignments outside of the 3C corridor if an unanticipated and

potentially significant effect upon a resource is identified during the Tier 2 Studies. However, if looking at an alignment outside of the 3C corridor is warranted, such alignment will still have to maintain connectivity to identified points along the 3C corridor as set forth in the Tier 1 ROD. It was noted that the connection points are Evansville, Oakland City, Washington, Crane NSWC, Bloomington, Martinsville, and Indianapolis.

Bill Ulik, a Section 4 sub-consultant, provided an overview of how a Community Impact Assessment is drafted and the CACs role in that process. It was explained that the project team will need the help of the CAC in identifying issues important to the CAC membership organizations that cannot be easily identified by the project team. The project team is researching business impacts by meeting with individual businesses, but the CAC should inform the project team of any issues regarding businesses of which they have special knowledge. It was noted that although the project team cannot answer the question of how the highway will affect property values at this time, they will be researching this issue. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation by Bill Ulik was provided to the CAC members.

One member commented that his organization wondered if the Section 4 team is under pressure to select a build alternative and therefore ignore important environmental resources. FHWA assured the CAC that no environmental issues could be ignored due to Federal law and noted that if an unexpected or underestimated negative impact upon a resource considered in the Tier 1 Study is discovered during Tier 2 that such discovery would be directed by FHWA to USEPA and could possibly lead to a supplement to the Tier 1 EIS.

### **Identification of Key Issues**

CAC members were asked to identify the issues they and their organizations would want considered in the planning and design of I-69. Key comments were listed on a flip-chart for discussion and for the record.

The comments could generally be grouped into the following categories:

- Access and Transportation Planning
- Economic Development
- Safety
- Community Planning
- Design

The comments associated with these categories are summarized below:

#### **Access and Transportation Planning**

- Maintaining existing and developing new local road access
- Developing new access/frontage roads, as may be needed
- Access across I-69 for farmers/farm equipment
- Improving safe and efficient access to Crane NSWC
- Community/areawide considerations for access to I-69
- Considerations for interchanges at locations other than those stated in the Tier 1 ROD
- Ensuring continuity of the transportation systems in Monroe and Greene Counties

## Economic Development

- Economic effects of the highway
- Determining if jobs will be created in the local communities
- Changes in property values

## Safety

- Creating ability to provide paramedic level ambulance service to Greene County
- Emergency responder's access to local properties and I-69

## Community and Planning

- Enacting zoning in Greene County and how such zoning may effect business development
- Controlling land uses around the highway
- Information on local planning grants as stated in the Tier 1 ROD
- Increasing communication between project team and local planning agencies
- Maintaining current and adding new bicycle routes, including routes along I-69 corridor
- Population changes due to new development and effects upon schools and school bus routes
- Consideration of school bus routes
- Information on FHWA enhancement grant program/projects
- Locating and avoiding cemeteries
- Noise and other pollution effects near homes
- Providing timely information about the project to property owners

## Design

- Highway drainage
- Aesthetic/visual enhancements along I-69 and interchanges, context sensitive solutions
- Project timeline/schedule

## In Conclusion

It was mentioned that committee members with information about cemeteries should visit the Section 4 Office and review the maps to make the project team aware of any unmarked sites.

A date for the next CAC meeting was not set but is anticipated to take place in either late January or early February, 2005.

CAC members were reminded to turn in their roster sheets. Also, all CAC members should indicate on their roster sheets if they would like to have their contact information shared with other CAC members.

**cc:** Section 4 CAC Members  
Section 4 Project Team Members

---

Bruce K. Hudson, DLZ Indiana, LLC  
Section 4 Project Manager

Attachment  
I-69 Tier 2 Studies, Section 4 CAC Meeting Attendance  
December 2, 2004

CAC Member Organization	Representative
Greene County Council	Ed Cullison
Jackson Township	Paul Trampke
Center Township	Kermit Holtsclaw
Van Buren Township	Gary Bruce
Bloomfield Town Board	Janet Basye
Eastern School District of Greene County	Randy Barrett
Bloomfield School District	Eric Moody
Monroe County Highway Department	Bill Williams
Monroe County Planning	Mary Ogle
Bloomington Economic Development Corp.	Cullen McCarty
Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce	Paul Tedesco
Greene County Financial Consortium	Lavon Yoho
Crane NSWC	David Poynter
Wabash Valley Human Services	Bertha Proctor
Bloomington Bicycle Club	John Smith
Bloomington Hospital and Healthcare System	Larry Bailey
Greene County Farm Bureau	Garry Heshelman
Farmers Field Acres	Jim Anderson
Greene Co. Agricultural Extension Services	Randi Miller

Project Team	
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	Tony DeSimone
Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT)	Lyle Sadler
Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, INC (BLA) <i>Project Management Consultant for corridor (PMC)</i>	Kent Ahrenholtz, Nicole Minton
DLZ Indiana, LLC <i>Project Management for Section 4</i>	Bruce Hudson, Brian Arterbery, Roger Hanas
Section 4 Sub-consultants	Bill Ulik, Jackie Rudd
Michael Baker, Jr. Inc. <i>Project Management for Section 5</i>	Wendy Vachet
PMC Representatives	Sandyha Markand, Doug Davidoff