



MEETING MINUTES

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

Morgan County Division of Family Resources
7851 Waverly Road Martinsville, IN 46151

September 27, 2016 from 8:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m. EDT

Attendee	Organization
CAC North	
Bob Babcock	Indiana Rail Road Company
Jason Holliday	Marion County City-County Councilor
Joe Krebsbach	Indianapolis Fire Department
Patrick Mapes	Perry Township School Corporation
Bill Long	Center Grove School Corporation
Shannon LeMaster	Family Social Services Administration
CAC South	
Jamie Thompson-Taylor	Martinsville Chamber of Commerce
Tosha Daughtery	Visit Morgan County
Dennis Mills	Martinsville School Corporation
Derek McGilvery	Morgan County Three Creeks Neighborhood Alliance
Steve Oschman	Greater Mooresville Area Committee
Joe Tutterrow	Morgan County Parks and Recreation
Katelyn Hurt	Morgan County Economic Development Organization
Stakeholder Working Group	
Paul Peoni	City of Greenwood
Luke Mastin	Johnson County Highway Department
Neil VanTrees	Johnson County Engineer
Stephanie Belch	Indy MPO
Larry Smith	Morgan County Engineer
I-69 Project Team	
Chris Meador	HNTB
Adin McCann	HNTB
Tim Miller	HNTB
Eric Swickard	Lochmueller Group
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Jim Earl	INDOT
Laura Hilden	INDOT

A. Formal Presentation

- I. Welcome
- II. Project Update (Sarah Rubin)
 - a. Project schedule – Sarah updated the CAC members on the project’s overall schedule.
 - b. Real Estate meeting – Sarah gave a brief summary of the Real Estate meetings INDOT recently hosted.
- III. Environmental Justice (Adin McCann / Chris Meador)
 - a. Purpose – Adin discussed the purpose and goal of Environmental Justice
 - b. Community of Comparison (COC) – Chris discussed how the project team’s methodology for identifying the COC.



- c. Additional Outreach – Chris encouraged CAC/SWG members to reach out to minority and/or low income populations about the project. Please contact the project team if you are aware of good meeting locations to host these meetings or have suggestions on contacts in the community whom could provide the INDOT project team additional information on low income or minority populations in the project area or should be provide the community organization survey. .
- IV. Section 106 (Tim Miller)
- a. Eligibility and Effects – Tim discussed eligibility criteria for a property to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Tim also discussed how the I-69, Section 6 project will effect historic resources within the project’s Area of Potential Effect (APE).
 - b. German Market Historic District – Tim identified where the Southside German Market Gardeners Historic District (SGMGHD) is located and what impacts the project might have on it. He also discussed that mitigation would be required for any adverse effects to the district. A meeting will be held with members of the SGMGHD to determine what sort of mitigation is appropriate.
- V. Fall Activities (Sarah Rubin)
- a. Archeology – Last fall INDOT completed archeological work for the portion of the project from Martinsville to Henderson Ford Road. INDOT will conduct archeological surveys from Henderson Ford Road to I-465 this fall.
 - b. Targeted outreach – Special meetings for low income or minority communities will be held along the corridor.
 - c. Refining project Alternatives – INDOT is continuing to make refinements to the project alternatives based on feedback.
 - d. Coordination with the SGMGHD – INDOT will meet with residents and stakeholders within this historic district.
 - e. Continued stakeholder involvement – INDOT will continue to update local project stakeholders on an as needed basis.
 - f. Noise analysis – The project team has collected ambient noise readings for the project. Build. Noise impacts will be modeled for the project and provided in the Draft EIS.
 - g. Traffic analysis – INDOT is continuing to make refinements to traffic forecasts.
- VI. Fourth Quarter Meetings (Sarah Rubin)
- a. Topics – Sarah identified potential topics for the 4th quarter CAC/SWG meetings.
 - b. Combined CACs – INDOT is considering combining the three groups into one meeting for the next meeting.

B. Questions/Statements and Responses

Question: Will Section 6 be delivered as a P3 (Public Private Partnership) project?

Response: A brief explanation of the P3 process was provided by INDOT. A couple example INDOT projects (Section 5 and ORB East End Crossing) were also provided. A project delivery method has not been identified for Section 6.

Question: Will the timing/completion of Section 5 impact the construction of Section 6?

Response: The construction of Section 6 is not dependent on the construction of Section 5. Section 6 will be completed on its own independent schedule.

Question: Are you asking CAC members to help you identify other pockets of low income or minority populations?



Response: Yes, please forward us information identifying any populations we have not identified through our research.

Question: How will the construction of the project impact low income or minority populations? Response: Issues such as access to specific businesses are items we want to consider for this project. The goal is for the communities to tell INDOT how the project will impact these individuals.

Question: Do you evaluate noise impacts for historic properties?

Response: Yes, the project team has taken ambient noise readings. The project team will run Traffic Noise Modeling (TNM) to determine noise increases associated with the project.

Question: Will a similar sort of noise analysis be conducted for non-historic properties?

Response: Yes, the project team will evaluate noise impacts for non-historic properties within the project area.

Statement: The Foxcliff community appreciates INDOT proposing to open Kristi Road. However, the community is still concerned about the overall response time for EMS providers. Please continue to keep this in mind as the project advances forward.

Response: INDOT will continue to coordinate with local EMS providers to ensure an adequate response times.

Question: Would it be possible to obtain a copy of the Historic Properties Report?

Response: The Historic Properties Report will be included in the Appendix of the DEIS.

Question: Will the Draft EIS identify a Preferred Alternative?

Response: Yes, the I-69, Section 6 Draft EIS will identify a Preferred Alternative.

Question: Will the Draft EIS identify interchange types or just interchange locations? If so, how will INDOT determine the interchange type?

Response: Yes, the Draft EIS will identify interchange types. The type of interchange will be driven by traffic flow, minimizing environmental impacts and local considerations.

Question: What is your traffic design year?

Response: The design year is 2045.

Question: Have you met with local planning professionals?

Response: Yes, we conducted two land use panel meetings.

Question: How far from existing SR 37 does your model forecast?

Response: The I-69 Corridor Model forecasts traffic on significant roadways in Marion, Hendricks, Morgan and Johnson Counties.

Question: Will there be room to expand travel lanes in the future?

Response: At this time, INDOT is focusing on providing capacity to year 2045. There may be areas where additional lanes can be added in the future without additional right of way.

Question: Do you know the construction method yet?

Response: No, INDOT has not identified a delivery method yet.

Question: When will you buy right of way?

Response: Right of way acquisition will not begin in earnest until the Record of Decision is issued. (early 2018)

Question: Are there any karst features in Section 6?

Response: No.

Question: Is there an update on construction of Section 5?

Response: The new revised completion date is October, 2017. INDOT and IFA are working together to work with the I-69 Development Partners to get the project back on track.



Question: When does Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) considerations begin?

Response: It can be considered before the ROD, but CSS typically occurs in the design phase.

Question: What is the delineation between what INDOT and the local communities maintain?

Response: INDOT will coordinate with the local communities to determine maintenance responsibilities. INDOT typically maintains the bridges over the interstates, interchange areas, and mainline. INDOT will construct the local service roads but maintenance would then be assumed by the local agency.

C. 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 Sarah Rubin at srubin@indot.in.us

Note: This meeting summary documents ongoing, internal agency deliberations. Accordingly, the information contained in this summary is considered to be pre-decisional and deliberative.