



**MEETING MINUTES**

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

Morgan County Division of Family Resources  
7851 Waverly Road Martinsville, IN 46151  
June 28, 2016 from 8:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m. EDT

<b>Attendee</b>	<b>Organization</b>
<b>CAC North</b>	
Pat Andrews	Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations
Bill Long	Center Grove School Corporation
Shannetta Griffin	Indianapolis Airport Authority
Jason Holliday	City County Councilor
David Holt	Conexus
Amy Cornell	IN Farm Bureau
Christian Maslowski	Greater Greenwood Chamber of Commerce
Cheryl Morphew	Johnson County Development Corporation
Ron West	Johnson County Commissioner
Jeremy Pell	White River Township Fire Dept.
Joe Krebsbach	Indianapolis Fire Department
Julie Young	Town of Bargersville
<b>CAC South</b>	
Anne Bono	Bloomington Chamber of Commerce
Justin Groenert	SW IN Chamber of Commerce
Derek McGilvray	Morgan County 3 Creeks Community
Greg McKelfresh	South Central Indiana REMC
Steve Oschman	Greater Mooresville Advisory Committee
Ryan Goodwin (for Jeff Quyle)	Morgan County Council
Jamie Thompson-Taylor	Martinsville Chamber of Commerce
Dennis Mills (for Michelle Moore)	Martinsville Schools
Joe Tutterrow	Morgan County Parks and Recreation
Terry Anderson	Martinsville Fire Department
Tosha Daugherty (observer)	Visit Morgan County
<b>Stakeholder Working Group</b>	
Anna Gremling	Indianapolis MPO
Meredith Klekotka	Indianapolis DMD
Mark Zwoyer	Indianapolis DPW
<b>I-69 Project Team</b>	
Jim Earl	INDOT
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Tim Miller	HNTB Corporation
Matt Miller	HNTB Corporation
Eric Swickard	Lochmueller Group

**I. Welcome/Introductions/New Member Recognition**

Sarah Rubin asked CAC members to identify whether they would like to continue participating in future CAC meetings. They can denote on the sign-in sheet as such. The intent is to not exclude anyone, but determine whether any existing member can no longer make the commitment.



## II. Project Update

Tim Miller provided an update on the status of the project and an overview of comments received during the April 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Public Information Meetings (PIMs). He also shared a list of organizations and groups INDOT has met with since the PIMs.

## III. Alternative Development

- a. Matt Miller identified changes to the project alternatives as a result of the PIMs and stakeholder meetings. He also discussed the traffic analysis that is currently being conducted for the project alternatives.
- b. Jim Earl discussed ongoing coordination with local government agencies regarding improvements in the corridor. While the I-69 project will be constructed by INDOT, some related projects to improve local road circulation will be the responsibility of local agencies.

## IV. Project Communication

Sarah Rubin discussed a variety of upcoming project communications and outreach activities:

- a. A Business Needs Survey will be distributed to businesses within 1 mile of the project. Anticipated to be sent out the week of July 11.
- b. Notice of Survey letters will be sent for field investigation activities in a few targeted areas. Anticipated to be sent out the week of July 11.
- c. New I-69 Section 6 Twitter and Facebook accounts will be established in the next several weeks.
- d. Special efforts have been made to identify Environmental Justice communities, and community meetings will be scheduled to make sure residents are aware of the project.
- e. A Real Estate Open House will be conducted in late July or August. The date and location is to be determined. This will address general questions regarding the process and timing of right of way acquisition and relocation.

## V. Questions/Statements and Responses

### A. CAC North

- Q. Will the existing SR 37 connection to I-465 remain?
  - A. It is currently planned to retain the existing Harding Street/I-465 interchange.
- S. Please consider improvements to I-465 west of Kentucky Avenue to I-70. Truck traffic causes weaving and congestion concerns.
- S. The two lane ramp from I-465 to I-70 west is dangerous. Consider additional improvements on the ramp.
- Q. Have you been in contact with Marion County/City of Indianapolis regarding upgrading County Line Road to four lanes?
  - A. Yes, Indianapolis is in the process of updating its Thoroughfare Plan. The type of project and timing has not been determined.
- Q. How are you deciding who pays for these “local projects”?
  - A. INDOT will work with local officials to determine how to fund local improvements. This typically occurs in the early portion of the design phase.



- Q. Discussions with INDOT were held regarding connecting Bluff Road between Smith Valley and Fairview Road. Has a determination been made yet?
- A. The project team looked into the possibility and the impacts seemed to be too significant.
- Q. Has INDOT looked at “wiggling” the right of way to avoid impacts?
- A. Yes, it depends on available right of way and potential impacts.
- Q. How do you compensate business owners who might lose their existing access to SR 37?
- A. INDOT does not compensate for loss of direct access. Efforts are made to accommodate access and logistics concerns when possible.
- S. Please keep in mind that farm ground is a business. It’s not development that’s just “waiting to happen”. Also be mindful about how farm equipment will access the roadway.
- Q. Do you calculate negative impacts on property values along with positive ones?
- A. The overall change in tax base for each county will be estimated. However, changes in the value of individual properties caused by the project are speculative and are not quantified.
- Q. How will the project be funded?
- A. The Indiana State Legislator is expected to consider a funding mechanism during the next legislative session.
- Q. When does a funding source need to be identified?
- A. A funding source has to be identified in the Final EIS.
- Q. Can you notify CAC members before the Business Needs Surveys are distributed?
- A. Yes.
- B. CAC South
- Q. Is there a way to better communicate that the public comment period during the public meeting is not a question / answer session?
- A. INDOT will examine ways to better reinforce that the comment period is not a question/answer session.
- S. Concerns have been raised about emergency service response times to the Foxcliff community.
- Q. Will noise impacts increase considering there will be fewer stop lights when I-69 becomes an interstate?
- A. Noise impacts will be presented and analyzed in the Draft EIS.
- S. It was greatly appreciated that INDOT met with the Morgan County Three Creeks Neighborhood Alliance steering committee.
- Q. A committee member just returned from Seattle where stop lights are used on ramps for each car. Is any consideration being given to taking this approach with the I-465 / I-69 interchange?
- A. Ramp metering is not being considered for this project at this time.
- Q. The C1 mainline profile (20 + feet above existing SR 37 grade), is it still under consideration?
- A. Yes, all three Alternatives will be evaluated in the Draft EIS.
- Q. Will the Facebook page be marketed?
- A. INDOT will examine how best to reach project stakeholders.



### C. Stakeholder Working Group

- S. Little Buck Creek is an important E/W trail connection. There are few E/W connections in southern Marion County.
- Q. Does the I-465 / I-69 connection still impact the gravel pits.
  - A. Yes, but different alternatives have different impacts.
- Q. Will C4 (Preferred Alternative) be released in the Draft EIS or before?
  - A. C4 will not be released to the public until the Draft EIS is issued.
- S. DMD would like a copy of traffic forecasts for Section 6. They would like this information for their Thoroughfare Plan.
- Q. Will INDOT fund local improvement projects related to the construction of I-69?
  - A. INDOT is open to discussion with local agencies.
- Q. Where are the Environmental Justice (EJ) communities located?
  - A. There are numerous EJ communities located throughout the I-69 study area.

### VI. 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](mailto: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.**