



MEETING MINUTES

**Section 6 Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
Stakeholder Working Group (SWG)**

Morgan County Division of Family Resources
7851 Waverly Road Martinsville, IN 46151
March 29, 2016 from 8:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. EDT

Attendee	Organization
CAC North – 8-10am	
Pat Andrews	Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations
Bob Babcock	IN Railroad Company
Shannetta Giffin	Indianapolis Airport Authority
Jason Holliday	City County Councilor
David Holt	Conexus
Andrew Klinger	Town of Plainfield
Christian Maslowski	Greater Greenwood Chamber of Commerce
Cheryl Morphew	Johnson County Development Corporation
Ron West	Johnson County Commissioner
Jeff Wilson	White River Township Fire Department
CAC South – 10:15-12:15	
Terry Anderson	Martinsville Fire Department
Lindsay Beckman	Morgan County EDC
Anne Bono	Bloomington Chamber of Commerce
Justin Groenert	SW IN Chamber of Commerce
Kenny Hale	Morgan County Planning
Shannon Kohl	City of Martinsville
Derek McGilvray	Morgan County 3 Creeks Community
Greg McKelfresh	South Central Indiana REMC
Steve Oschman	Greater Mooresville Advisory Committee
Jamie Thompson Taylor	Martinsville Chamber of Commerce
Joe Tutterrow	Morgan County Parks and Recreation
Norman Voyles	Morgan County
CAC South Guests	
Terry Brock	Morgan County Surveyor
Tosha Daugherty	Visit Morgan County
Mark Mathis	Mooresville Town Council
Kenny Murphy	Martinsville Police Department
David Marcotte	Mooresville School Corporation
Stakeholder Working Group – 2-4pm	
John Ayres	Hendricks County
Stephanie Belch	Indianapolis MPO
Luke Mastin	Johnson County
Larry Smith	Morgan County
Travis Underhill	City of Franklin
I-69 Project Team – 8am-4pm	
Jim Earl	INDOT
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	HNTB Corporation
Tim Miller	HNTB Corporation
Chris Meador	HNTB Corporation
Eric Swickard	Lochmueller Group



- I. Welcome
- II. Introductions
 - a. Introduction of CAC and SWG members and project team
- III. Project Update
 - a. Jim Earl updated the meeting attendees about the upcoming release of the Preliminary Alternative Screening Report, press conference, and upcoming Public Information Meetings (PIMs).
- IV. Draft Public Information Meeting Presentation
 - a. Jim gave the presentation to the CAC/SWG members that will be given at the PIMs.
- V. Discussion and Questions
 - A. CAC North**
 - Q. Will a performance matrix be provided for Alternative Alignments C1, C2, and C3?
 - A. Yes, Appendix B of the Preliminary Alternative Screening Report provides performance measures and natural and human environmental impacts per Alternative.
 - Q. Are the interchange locations roughly the same as the last CAC meeting?
 - A. An interchange at Ohio Street is now under consideration.
 - Q. Where will the public meetings be held?
 - A. April 4th at Perry Meridian High School and April 5th at Martinsville High School
 - Q. Can you describe the public input you received on the Alternatives?
 - A. Tim Miller explained that as a result of the November 30, December 2-3 public meetings, there were several comments supporting Alternative C in lieu of supporting the western alternatives. Tim stressed the process is not a vote. However, public input is always considered in the alternative selection process.
 - Q. Was there support for Alternative C among residents who live along SR 37 or just support amongst those who live on B, D, K3, and K4?
 - A. Yes, INDOT received support from a variety of locations.
 - Q. Can you explain the right of way verses construction limits on the displays that will be presented at the public information meetings?
 - A. Jim explained the legends on the map displays.
 - Q. Is there potential to collaborate with INDOT's contractor for local governments to "piggy back" on the construction of I-69, Section 6?
 - A. It will depend on the type of collaboration. However, INDOT will be working with local government agencies to collect feedback on the proposed local access roads. INDOT will pay for the construction cost of the proposed local access roads while the local agency is responsible for long term maintenance.
 - Q. Will a funding source have to be identified in the EIS?
 - A. Potential funding sources will be addressed in the Final EIS and Record of Decision.
 - Q. How did you decide how many interchanges to identify?
 - A. Current and projected traffic volumes, spacing, and public input are factors considered when determining interchange locations.
 - Q. Why are there more interchange locations in Martinsville than Marion County?
 - A. Tim and Jim explained the reasoning for each interchange and grade separation location in Marion County. They also explained why an interchange at Ohio Street is now under consideration.



- Q. Will you be impacting Sunshine Gardens neighborhood on the north end of the project?
- A. There may be some impacts but it is the intent to either avoid or minimize impacts to the neighborhood.
- Q. Is the final alignment decision with the locals?
- A. No, INDOT in conjunction with FHWA will make the final decisions. INDOT will reach out to the local agencies to obtain their feedback. Any roads that will be ultimately maintained by the locals will require coordination with the respective local agencies.
- Q. Is it possible for local agencies to piggy back on the State's environmental process?
- A. It is possible, but it is something that needs further consideration.
- Q. Can you explain why you eliminated non-Alternative C options?
- A. B, D, K3 and K4 did not perform as well overall as Alternative C. The other Alternatives did not merit consideration to advance forward for detailed analysis.
- Q. A CAC member advised INDOT to be cautious about support for the Commerce Connector, at least concerning the local governments.
- A. INDOT selected Alternative C based on the Purpose and Need for the Section 6 project. Section 6 was never intended to support the Commerce Connector. They are independent projects.
- Q. What techniques can you apply to protect the Perry Aquifer?
- A. INDOT will evaluate the current and future condition and summarize its findings and any mitigation measures in the final EIS.
- Q. How much new roadway will be constructed along I-465?
- A. INDOT anticipates construction along I-465 to be from Mann Road to US 31. The final determination will be made in conjunction with FHWA.
- Q. How much will traffic increase when Section 6 is constructed?
- A. Traffic forecasts are ongoing.
- Q. Is this the point in the process when INDOT considers noise walls?
- A. INDOT is conducting a noise study which will be included in the EIS. The study will determine approximate locations where noise barriers will be considered in the design phase. A final decision regarding noise barrier locations will be made in the design phase.
- Q. What sort of capacity for future expansion is INDOT considering?
- A. INDOT is planning the interstate to accommodate projected traffic in 2045.
- Q. Do you have a ceiling cost that you cannot exceed?
- A. No, there is not a "cap" for Section 6. INDOT is mindful of cost and will be developing alternatives that meet the Purpose and Need and does so in an efficient manner.
- B. CAC South**
- Q. Can you "piecemeal" the Alternatives together?
- A. For the most part yes; at least regarding interchanges and overpasses. Design criteria for the mainline is more difficult to piece together.
- Q. Do you still have a spacing requirement for interchange locations?
- A. Yes, the spacing requirement is 1 mile in an urban area and 3 miles in a rural area.
- Q. A significant issue for many constituents is how many lanes will be constructed.



- A. The highway will be designed to accommodate 2045 forecasted traffic. It is anticipated that 2 through lanes (4 total) will be constructed from SR 39 to SR 144, 3 through lanes (6 total) from SR144 to Southport Road, and 4 through lanes (8 total) from Southport Road to I-465. Truck climbing lanes and/or an auxiliary lane will be considered where appropriate.
- Q. Will all the through lanes be elevated through Martinsville? Can you think of other examples of a similar roadway in Indiana?
- A. Elevating the I-69 mainline travel lanes on fill is an option. Interchanges along US 31 through Carmel and Westfield are elevated in this manner. Portions of the Lloyd Expressway are also elevated. The commenter noted that elevated highways are less desirable esthetically. Elevated does not mean on piers.
- Q. How will work on the SR 39 bridge over the White River be reused?
- A. This project is not expected to extend to the SR 39 bridge over the White River. INDOT does not have any plans to widen SR 39 as part of this project outside of the I-69/SR39 interchange limits.
- Q. Are there any monies to relocate a firehouse that will now be separated by I-69?
- A. Not that INDOT is aware of. It doesn't pay damages for separating firehouses from those individuals it serves.
- Q. Traffic is increasing in Martinsville due to construction of Section 5. Specifically at the intersection of SR 37 and SR 252. It has experienced fatal accidents prior to the start of Section 5 construction.
- A. Yes, INDOT is currently evaluating and considering measures to warn motorists exiting/entering the Section 5 construction zone.
- Q. There has been an uptick of semi-trucks along SR 39 (and SR 144) due to the construction of Section 5. How will INDOT address this?
- A. Jim acknowledged this is likely occurring due to the overall construction season has begun, not just Section 5. See above response.
- Q. Will Section 6 be constructed all at the same time?
- A. Construction phasing is not known at this time.
- Q. Is the fire at the Flying J at I-456 / SR 37 going to affect the project?
- A. No.
- Q. Is it okay to arrange a meeting with our larger constituencies?
- A. Yes, in fact INDOT encourages you to disseminate this information back to your larger organization.
- Q. Will these maps be available on the project website?
- A. Yes, INDOT will place the will place the maps on the project website after the first PIM.
- Q. Who maintains the overpasses once they are constructed?
- A. Local government agencies maintain the local roadways. INDOT will maintain the interstate. Bridge structures (such as overpasses) are maintained by the State. Local improvements (such as adding capacity) would need to be approved by INDOT.
- Q. Are there policies regarding activities or conduct on overpasses?
- A. There is no known policy. Fencing on the overpasses can be considered.
- Q. Will there be noise walls for Section 6?



- A. INDOT is conducting a noise study which will be included in the EIS. The study will determine approximate locations where noise barriers will be considered in the design phase. A final decision regarding noise barrier locations will be made in the design phase.

C. Stakeholder Working Group

- Q. Is there a location where impacts are disclosed to support INDOT's decision?
A. Yes, impact tables are shown in the Screening Report.
- Q. Is there an opportunity for locals to partner with INDOT to develop and construct local access roads beyond the scope of Section 6?
A. Possibly, INDOT will need to examine the possibility to collaborate with the locals on such projects.
- Q. Is there a planning grant program for Section 6?
A. No, that planning process was completed as part of a Tier 1 commitment.
- Q. How will the interchange at I-465 be constructed.
A. A new interchange will be constructed to the west of the current I-465/SR 37 interchange. Added capacity might be warranted along I-465 to accommodate additional traffic.
- Q. The footprint of the interchanges is quite large. Might not be much ROW left once it is constructed.
A. Comment noted
- Q. Can INDOT "tweak" a design if a developer wants to change access based on a development?
A. Yes, but it may require a re-evaluation document. INDOT prefers to work with developers earlier in the process.
- Q. Can the displays be made available to SWG members?
A. Maps of Alternatives C1, C2, and C3 are available in the Screening Report, which is available on the project website. The PIM displays will be available on the project website.
- Q. For roads located within a floodplain will they be designed to Q100 standards?
A. The design of local access roads in floodplain is dependent upon the functional class. The draft EIS will address this topic.
- Q. What is the limited access set back from the interchange locations?
A. It's based on sight distance requirements, but it's approximately ¼ mile.
- Q. Has funding been determined for the project?
A. No.

VI. Next Steps / Schedule

- a. Jim Earl explained the overall project schedule remains the same. A Draft EIS will be issued in the first quarter, 2017. A Record of Decision (ROD) is anticipated to be issued in the first quarter, 2018.

VII. Adjourn

Details discussed in this meeting are subject to change. This summary is a reflection of the status of these items at the close of the meeting. These meeting minutes represent the understanding of the events that occurred. Please forward any comments or revisions to the attention of LaMar Holliday at lholliday@indot.in.gov.