



**FINAL MEETING MINUTES**  
**Section 6 Community Advisory Committees (CAC)**  
**Stakeholder Working Group (SWG)**  
 Southland Community Church  
 Greenwood, Indiana  
 September 12, 2017 from 9:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.

Attendee	Organization
<b>CAC / SWG</b>	
Terry Anderson	Martinsville Fire Department
Tosha Daughtery	Visit Morgan County
Justin Groenert	Evansville Chamber
Kenny Hale	Morgan County
Jason Holliday	Indianapolis City Council
Meredith Klekotta	City of Indianapolis
Joe Krebsbach	Indianapolis Fire Department
Anthony Krycka	City of Franklin
Lawrence Bryan	Morgan County Three Creeks Neighborhood Alliance
Shannon LeMaster	FSSA-Division of Family Resources
Bill Long	Center Grove School Corporation
Greg McKelfresh	South Central Indiana REMC
Dana Monson	Johnson County Development Corporation
Michelle Moore	Martinsville School Corporation
Jeremy Pell	White River Township Fire Department
Joe Tutterrow	Morgan County - Parks and Recreation
Jamie Thompson-Taylor	Martinsville Chamber of Commerce
Norman Voyles	Morgan County Commissioner
Ron West	Johnson County Commissioner
Steve Oschman	Greater Mooresville Advisory Committee
<b>I-69 Project Team</b>	
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Jim Earl	INDOT
Andy Dietrick	INDOT
Katie Rounds	INDOT
Laura Hilden	INDOT
LaMar Holliday	INDOT
Joe Bruno	INDOT-Indiana Logo Sign Program
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Tim Miller	HNTB
Christine Meador	HNTB
Jenifer Goins	HNTB



## **I. Welcome and Introductions**

Sarah Rubin (INDOT Project Manager) welcomed everyone and asked attendees to introduce themselves. She also discussed the meeting agenda and shared a video from INDOT Commissioner Joe McGuinness thanking CAC members for their participation.

## **II. Project Update and Public outreach**

A. The public outreach efforts have included five meeting milestones at multiple locations and attracted more than 4,000 attendees. Additional public outreach activities included the project office, social media, and the email list serve.

## **III. Post-NEPA Outreach/Coordination**

- A. INDOT will continue to hold meetings as requested
- B. As INDOT moves forward, outreach will be on a more individual and specific basis
- C. Project updates will continue to be shared via the listserv, social media, and quarterly newsletter

## **IV. Refined Preferred Alternative – Alternative C4 from the Draft EIS has been refined based on input from public, agencies, value engineering.**

- A. I-69 from SR 39 to south of Smith Valley will have 4 lanes (2 in each direction)
- B. I-69 from south of Smith Valley to Southport will have 6 lanes (3 in each direction)
- C. I-69 from Southport to I-465 will have 8 lanes (4 in each direction)
- D. I-465 will have 8 lanes (4 in each direction) between Mann Road and US 31
- E. Project overview – A slide was shown explaining how to read the symbology on the maps.

## **V. The presentation walked through the project limits noting major changes between Alternative C4 and the Refined Preferred Alternative (RPA). Specific slides included:**

- A. Southern project limits – No major refinements
- B. SR 39 Interchange – No major refinements
- C. Burton Lane – An overpass was included in C4. No overpass is included in the RPA. This change reduces costs and relocations. The Martinsville Baptist Tabernacle Church and School is no longer a potential relocation.
- D. Ohio Street interchange – C4 included a tight diamond with impacts to business and FEMA purchased property. RPA changed to include a tight diamond interchange with roundabout intersections. A local access extension of Mahalsville Road is added. These changes reduce business relocations and accommodates the proposed U.S. bike route.
- E. Grand Valley – The RPA maintains Birk Road intersection at current location to reduce number of relocations
- F. Artesian Avenue – The RPA constructs a roadway called Artesian Avenue from Mahalsville Road to Grand Valley Boulevard in lieu of extending Industrial Drive as shown in C4. This change reduces traffic through the industrial area, reduces relocations, provides more direct connection to commercial areas.



- G. Spring Valley and Sun Valley mobile home communities- RPA reduces relocations from 30 shown in C4 to one.
- H. SR 252/SR 44 interchanges – No major refinements
- I. Twin Branch Road – No major refinements
- J. Teeters Road overpass – No major refinements. Note access to golf course will be maintained.
- K. Myra Lane underpass – No major refinements
- L. Egbert Road overpass – Overpass shifted to avoid properties purchased with FEMA funds and access road within neighborhood revised
- M. Henderson Ford Road interchange – Interchange shifted to avoid wetland areas and stream west of Henderson Ford Road.
- N. Ennis Road – No major refinements
- O. Cragen Road – No major refinements
- P. Perry Road overpass – No major refinements
- Q. Old SR 37 – No major refinements
- R. Big Bend Road overpass – C4 included an overpass, RPA does not include overpass at Big Bend Road. It was eliminated due to public comments and a re-evaluation during the value engineering workshop.
- S. Waverly and Whiteland Roads – No major refinements. Overpass will be at Waverly Road.
- T. Banta Road - No major refinements
- U. SR 144 Interchange – C4 included a tight diamond interchange. RPA revised to include a partially folded diamond interchange to reduce the number of commercial impacts. A new connection between Huggin Hollow Road and Old SR 37 was added to eliminate mile long cul de sac. The access road east of I-69 is aligned to match with commercial development to southeast.
- V. Stones Crossing and Travis Roads – C4 included an overpass at Stone Crossing with impacts to Greenwood Mobile Home Community. The RPA does not include an overpass at Stones Crossing Road but does extend the access road east of I-69 from Travis Road to Stones Crossing Road resulting in less costs, one additional residential relocation east of I-69, and several fewer residential relocations at the Greenwood Mobile Home Community.
- W. Olive Branch Road – No major refinements
- X. Smith Valley Road to Fairview Road – The RPA changes ramp intersections to roundabouts and a roundabout is added at the Smith Valley and Mullinix intersection. The local access road west of I-69 is realigned to be closer to I-69 which reduces costs for utility relocation and reduces the size of the bridge over Honey Creek.
- Y. Fairview Road – No major refinements. The RPA adds a retaining wall on east side to avoid acquisition of CVS and neighboring businesses.
- Z. County Line Road interchange – No major refinements
- AA. Wicker Road underpass – No major refinements
- BB. Belmont Avenue - No major refinements
- CC. Southport Road interchange - Two alternatives were presented in the DEIS – C4a



which impacted Aspen Lakes or C4b which impacted the commercial areas to the northwest. The RPA includes the a refined C4b which is less expensive and has less residential relocations compared to C4a even though it does relocate more businesses. The RPA includes right of way in this area to accommodate drainage detention.

- DD. Banta and Edgewood underpasses - No major refinements
- EE. Epler underpass and ramps – no major refinements
- FF. I-465 interchange – RPA tightens alignments of ramps to minimize size of bridges and reduce impacts to Hanson Aggregates on north side of I-465 by about 40 acres.
- GG. I-465 bridge over White River – C4 including rehabilitation of existing bridge, but RPA includes replacement. The decision has not yet been made whether to widen existing piers or build fewer new piers.
- HH. I-465 interchange at Mann Road – RPA includes a noise barrier from Mann Road to Mooresville Road on north side that was not part of C4.
- II. I-465 and US 31 area – No major refinements
- JJ. I-465 and Bluff Road area – RPA includes reconstructing I-465 approximately two feet higher than the existing I-465 to provide adequate vertical clearance on Bluff Road, Meridian Street, and Harding Street.

## VI. What's Next?

- A. Schedule – INDOT is still on schedule to publish a final EIS and Record of Decision in the first quarter of 2018. Construction will begin in Martinsville in FY 2020.
- B. Project funding – Next Level Funding Plan – I-69 Section 6 received \$ 0.5 Billion
- C. Kitchen table meetings – one-on-one meetings with property owners are underway in Martinsville
- D. Pre-development Activities
  1. Beam, Longest and Neff was recently selected to perform property acquisition services. Right of way acquisition activities will begin in earnest after the ROD.
  2. Design Request for Proposal – Construction in Martinsville will be contracted as a traditional Design-Bid-Build contract. A request for proposal to select the design firm will be advertised today with the anticipation that the design firm will begin final design activities by the end of the year.
- E. Safety is top priority
  1. Survey, Geotech, and other field work will be on-going.
  2. All field team members have an I-69 Section 6 ID badge.
  3. If property owners are concerned about the authenticity of the ID, they should call the project office.
  4. If property owners feel threatened, they should call local law enforcement.
  5. INDOT will try to let everyone know where crews may be through social media and press releases.
- F. Comment period – Provide comments on the refinements to the preferred



alternative by September 29, 2017

## VII. Signage, Noise and Lighting

- A. Highway Signs
  - 1. I-69 will be signed around the east side of I-465.
  - 2. Signage around I-465 will be constructed as a separate construction contract.
  - 3. Logo sign program - Indiana logo sign group
    - a. This program provides tourism and directional signs (TODs)
    - b. Logo sign program includes signs to attractions, lodging, dining, fuel, etc.
    - c. There will be limited space for signage between the SR 252 and SR 44 interchanges.
    - d. Community signage – Hospital, airport, etc. will be provided
    - e. Information on the signage program can be found at [www.indianalogo.com](http://www.indianalogo.com)
- B. Sound barriers
  - 1. A graphic of typical sound levels for various activities was reviewed.
  - 2. Sound barriers must be feasible and reasonable to be constructed. Additionally, they must be supported by the majority of the affected receivers and must be an effective noise deterrent at a reasonable cost per receiver.
  - 3. Reviewed potential locations for noise barriers and types of noise barriers.
  - 4. A sample of noise barrier was available to touch and feel at the meeting.
- C. Lighting – mostly at interchanges with different lighting effects depending on rural or urban area.

## VIII. Questions

- A. Is INDOT working with the railroad regarding changing the grade of I-465?
  - 1. Yes, they have been invited to CAC, and INDOT will reach out to them during design.
- B. When is the timing to start discussions on logo signage?
  - 1. The best time to follow up is at the end of design and during construction.
- C. After the ROD, is there a way for locals to work alongside INDOT on design and construction for local road work to be incorporated into projects? Specifically thinking of access road at Smith Valley Road.
  - 1. There could be opportunities to partner depending on the work to be completed. Locals should coordinate proposed projects with INDOT. INDOT can then determine if there are opportunities.
- D. How do you recommend which way the route goes around I-465?
  - 1. Usually it is the closest or more direct route. If that results in additional roadway congestions then that roadway will be upgraded.
- E. When will maps be available?
  - 1. Maps will be available tonight on the INDOT web site and tomorrow in



- the project office.
- F. Is it accurate to say CAC is complete?
1. Yes, INDOT will be moving into more individual discussions. There will be no more CAC meetings scheduled.
- G. How will maintenance of traffic be conducted?
1. Specifics of maintenance of traffic provisions are determined during final design. The contractors are to coordinate changes in access with business and residential property owners. Typically, there would be no pedestrian access during construction if no pedestrian access exists before construction. Access to businesses will be maintained during construction.
- H. When do local governments advocate for aesthetics?
1. That is appropriate to complete during the design phase. Aesthetics is also a component of noise barrier meetings. Note that INDOT typically does not pay for the aesthetics, the expenses to build and maintain aesthetic treatments are typically born by the local governments.

## **IX. 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.gov](mailto:srubin@indot.in.gov)*

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