



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS TIER 2 STUDIES

Section 6 – CAC North Summary

I-69, Section 6 Community Advisory Committee (CAC) North

Meeting Summary

January 29, 2015

CAC Attendees

Name	Title	Representing
Dr. Frank Giles	Associate Superintendent	Perry Township Schools
Dr. William Long	Assistant Superintendent	Center Grove School Corp.
Bill Boyd	Director for Perry Township	MCANA
Travis Underhill	City Engineer	City of Franklin
Shannetta Griffin	Sr. Director of Planning and Development	Indianapolis Airport Authority
Megan Ritter	Director, Public Policy	Indiana Farm Bureau
Christian Maslowski	President	Greater Greenwood Chamber of Commerce
Jason Holiday	City-County Councilor	Marion County
Non-CAC Members		
Sarah Rubin	Project Manager	INDOT
Kevin Hetrick	Project Manager	INDOT
Janice Osadczuk	Team Leader	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	Engineering Manager	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	Project Manager	HNTB
Tim Miller	Dep. Project Manager	Lochmueller Group

I. Presentation and General Discussion:

The meeting began with introductions and a summary of the decision-making process. INDOT presented a PowerPoint presentation that contained the following information:

- o Summary, purpose, protocol, and role of the Stakeholder groups;
- o Update on the status of I-69 between Evansville and Martinsville;
- o Scoping and Project Development Process;
- o Screening Criteria;
- o Public Involvement Activities
- o Project Schedule



At the conclusion of the presentation, participants were asked for general questions and comments.

General Notes

1. CAC members would like a copy of the PowerPoint Presentation presented at each CAC meeting.
2. INDOT will contact CAC members before future meeting dates to determine if there are conflicts with meeting dates.
3. It was suggested that INDOT provide the names of the other two stakeholder groups, south CAC and the Stakeholder Working Group.
4. Consider inviting Mooresville and Decatur Township Schools to the CAC.
5. Meeting summaries should be provided as soon as possible. It will be critical to accurately communicate information to organization members.
6. It was suggested that summaries of the South CAC and the SWG be provided.
7. The CAC is an advisory group.

Questions & Answers

1. Is there a process for determining consensus for CAC members?
Answer – It is not the intent of a CAC to always come to consensus. The purpose the CAC is to provide feedback and input on the project. INDOT will document CAC member input in the form of meeting summaries. These summaries will be included as an appendix in the Section 6 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). This input, along with a variety of other factors, will determine the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
2. Why are non-SR 37 alternatives being considered? How will a Preferred Alternative be selected?
Answer –The original decision to utilize the existing SR37 was made in 2004. Due to the potential for significant impacts and or changed conditions, INDOT and FHWA may consider alternatives outside the selected corridor.
INDOT will equally consider impacts and benefits of all Alternatives when selecting a preferred alternative. Ultimately FHWA will approve the selection of a Preferred Alternative in concert with INDOT. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will document the reason for the selection of a Preferred Alternative.
3. Was there “buy-in” from community officials on the selected Tier 1 corridor??
Answer - Like many large transportation projects, some supported utilizing the existing SR37 corridor while others had other opinions.
4. Is INDOT determining the route or is there a decision whether I-69 will be constructed?
Answer - INDOT is committed to completing I-69, up to and through construction.

II. CAC Goals and Expectations:



Members of the CAC were asked to provide their goals and expectations of their CAC involvement. The following is a summary of those goals and expectations.

1. Focus more on information gathering than providing feedback.
2. Need to consider business interests along SR 37 who have put expansion plans on hold. The faster INDOT comes to a decision, the faster economic growth can be realized.
3. Timely and accurate information is critical.
4. Farmland is already developed and has a business purpose; it should not be considered “undeveloped land”.
5. Consider effects on separating school districts if a school district is severed by an interstate. School districts continue building new schools and should be taken into consideration when determining where to construct new roads.
6. Represent your organization, but look at regional/state benefits and impacts. Keep a global view as much as you protect your organization’s interest.
7. Ensure all goals and impacts are equally examined.
8. Ensure input provided by CAC members is seriously considered.
9. Safety considerations along SR 37 are important.
10. Provide information on how a Preferred Alternative is selected.
11. Foster an environment for members to freely provide opinions, input and voice concerns.

III. Considerations Outside Tier 1 Corridor:

What goals should INDOT & FHWA consider important for I-69 Section 6? What considerations should INDOT and FHWA take into account when determining if alternatives outside the approved Tier 1 Corridor will be evaluated?

1. Examine what has changed over the last 10 years. INDOT should re-examine original selection in light of what has changed since the Tier 1 corridor was approved. Consider development at the SR 37/Southport Road intersection. Specifically, Southern Dunes development area. An apartment complex with 400 units is currently under construction. A housing development with 200 units on the west side of Wicker Road and SR 37 is now in the planning phase.
2. The SR37/I-465 interchange area may have significant commercial impacts. The connection with I-465 in this interchange area will be very challenging.
3. Legislation that could affect an alternative in Perry Township should be considered.
4. INDOT should recognize it might have similar concerns whether it constructs I-69 on SR 37 or off the existing alignment.
5. INDOT should help CAC members understand development potential of I-69. Specifically, where would access roads be constructed? How much and what



types of businesses might develop along various potential corridors? Existing businesses along SR 37 include technology, services and agriculture industries.

6. Consider construction cost associated with constructing on new alignment verses existing alignment including right of way and utility costs.
7. Embrace the “build it and they will come” mentality. Development will follow I-69, regardless where it is located.
8. Neighborhood impacts should also be considered. Dead-end roads and land-locked parcels will have a negative impact on residents. There are economic impacts to drivers who have to make longer commutes.
9. Public safety impacts should be considered; such as the location of rail road crossings and emergency services.



I-69, Section 6 Community Advisory Committee (CAC) South

Meeting Summary

January 29, 2015

CAC Attendees

Name	Title	Representing
Roger Wiltermood	Chief	Martinsville Police Department
Liz Irwin	Director of Advocacy and Government Affairs	Bloomington Chamber of Commerce
Joe Tutterrow	Board President	Morgan County Parks and Recreation
Phil Deckard	Mayor	City of Martinsville
Normal Voyles	Commissioner	Morgan County
Kevin McGinnis	Manager	Town of Bargersville
Michele Moore	Superintendent	Martinsville Consolidated School District
Chelsey Manns	Executive Director	Morgan County Economic Development Corporation
Jamie Thompson-Taylor	Executive Director	Martinsville Chamber of Commerce
Robert Carter	Chief	Martinsville Fire Department
Greg McKelfresh	CEO	South Central Indiana REMC
Kenny Hale	Director of Planning	Morgan County
Non-CAC members		
JR Blondell	Assistant Chief	Martinsville Fire Department
Sarah Rubin	Project Manager	INDOT
Kevin Hetrick	Project Manager	INDOT
Janice Osadcuk	Team Leader	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	Engineering Manager	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	Project Manager	HNTB
Tim Miller	Dep. Project Manager	Lochmueller Group

I. Presentation and General Discussion:

The meeting began with introductions and a summary of the decision-making process. INDOT presented a PowerPoint presentation that contained the following information:

- Summary, purpose, protocol, and role of the stakeholder groups;
- Update on the status of I-69 between Evansville and Martinsville;
- Scoping and Project Development Process;
- Screening Criteria;

Section 6 – CAC South Summary



- Public Involvement Activities
- Project Schedule

At the conclusion of the presentation, participants were asked for general questions and comments.

General Notes

1. Do not wait for alternatives on paper before providing input. Let your input drive the development of alternatives.
2. Consider creating a portal for CAC members to obtain project information.
3. The CAC is an advisory committee.

Questions and Answers

1. Will the route north of Martinsville change?
Answer –The original decision to utilize the existing SR37 was made in 2004. Due to the potential for significant impacts and or changed conditions, INDOT and FHWA may consider alternatives outside the selected corridor.
2. How do the ideas developed by the CAC balance with Screening Criteria?
Answer – The decision-making process requires consideration of a wide range of impacts and input when selecting a Preferred Alternative. This includes input from the CAC and other public involvement opportunities.
3. Who are the decision makers?
Answer - It's a joint decision making process between INDOT and FHWA.

II. CAC Goals and Expectations:

Members of the CAC were asked to provide their goals and expectations of their CAC involvement. The following is a summary of those goals and expectations:

1. Establish ways to get the latest project information. Make sure CAC members have messaging points to ensure consistent information is shared.
2. Provide timely and accurate information. Notify CAC members prior to sending out Notice of Survey letters.
3. Notify CAC members of major milestones so they can inform their constituents.
4. Public safety concerns are important. Ensure fire/ambulance considerations are noted.
5. Minimize impacts to farming community and floodplains. Consider natural resource impacts.
6. Accessibility, economic development and connection to schools are important.
7. Transparency, share what we know about Section 6. Should lead off most meetings discussing most current information. Have a “recap” from the last meeting.



8. Maintain flexibility throughout the process.
9. Disseminate information more frequently than quarterly. Do not have to meet more often than that, but information should be shared more frequently.
10. Planning cycle is underway. Would like to see someone representing the natural environment and farmland on the CAC.
11. Access and economic development impacts are critical.
12. Educate CAC members on why or why not INDOT/FHWA should consider alternatives outside the Tier 1 corridor.
13. Consideration should be given to CAC input in addition to quantifiable impacts.

III. Considerations Outside Tier 1 Corridor:

What goals should INDOT & FHWA consider important for I-69 Section 6? What considerations should INDOT and FHWA take into account when determining if alternatives outside the approved Tier 1 Corridor will be evaluated?

1. Change in access should be a consideration.
2. Funding concerns: cost of building on new terrain verses existing alignments. Identifying a cost-efficient solution should be a consideration.
3. Consider doing an outer loop. P3 or tolling should be considered.
4. Maximize economic impact for Morgan County and the region. Consider the project's close proximity to Indianapolis and the Indianapolis International Airport with respect to economic development.
5. Local communities have made zoning changes and constructed access roads in order to prepare for I-69 on SR 37. Need to consider local improvements and investments that have been made during the past 10 years into consideration.
6. Review local planning documents when determining the preferred alternative. They contain valuable information about community goals and growth plans.
7. Consideration should be given to moving goods and freight around the country when deciding if alternatives outside the corridor be considered.
8. Legislative and political input should be considered.
9. Recognize the regional nature of I-69. It is not just economic development for Martinsville, Morgan County or Indiana. There are national economic benefits for I-69. Need to ensure that the best alternatives that yield economic benefits be given consideration.
10. Consider impacts and status to SR 37 if I-69 is constructed off existing alignment What improvements will be needed to SR37 if I-69 is located elsewhere
11. Consider impacts on I-465 when I-69 is constructed. Traffic on I-465 will become worse.
12. The most direct route from Martinsville to Indianapolis is SR 37. Often times the most direct route is the best.



I-69, Section 6 Stakeholder Working Group (SWG)

Meeting Summary

January 29, 2015

SWG Attendees

Name	Title	Organization
John Ayers	Engineer	Hendricks County
Mike Pelham	Engineer	Johnson County Highway Engineer
Lucas Mastin	Director	Johnson County Highway Depart.
Mark Richards	Engineer	City of Greenwood
Krista Linke	Community Development Director	City of Franklin
Ross Holloway	Engineer	City of Martinsville
Ryan Gallagher	Transit Planner	IndyGo
Anna Gremling	Director	Indianapolis MPO
Non-CAC Members		
Ron West	Commissioner	Johnson County
Sarah Rubin	Project Manager	INDOT
Kevin Hetrick	Project Manager	INDOT
Janice Osadczuk	Team Leader	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	Engineering Manager	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	Project Manager	HNTB
Tim Miller	Dep. Project Manager	Lochmueller Group

I. Presentation and General Discussions:

The meeting began with introductions and a summary of the decision-making process. INDOT presented a PowerPoint presentation that contained the following information:

- Summary, purpose, protocol, and role of the Stakeholder groups;
- Update on the status of I-69 between Evansville and Martinsville;
- Scoping and Project Development Process;
- Screening Criteria;
- Public Involvement Activities
- Project Schedule

At the conclusion of the presentation, participants were asked for general questions and comments.



Questions and Answers

1. Was the decision to go outside the corridor driven by the Major Moves legislation that could affect an alternative in Perry Township?

Answer – No. The original decision to utilize the existing SR37 was made in 2004. Due to the potential for increased impacts and or changed conditions, INDOT and FHWA may consider alternatives outside the selected corridor.

2. Is INDOT’s consideration for going outside the corridor the reason for a Tier 2 document?

Answer - No, each Section of I-69 included Tier 2 studies. The Tier 1 decision was to determine a corridor for I-69 from Evansville to Indianapolis. Each of the five previous sections of I-69 have had a Tier 2 Environmental Impact Statement prepared.

3. Will copies of the presentation be made available to the SWG members?

Answer - Yes.

II. CAC Goals and Expectations:

Members of the SWG were asked to provide their goals and expectations of their SWG involvement. The following is a summary of those goals and expectations.

1. SWG should know what “absolutes” that cannot be impacted. Would like to know if there are any such resources within the project area.
2. Provide accurate, timely information and facilitate open dialog.
3. How will IndyGo routes be impacted? Please address in future meetings.
4. We need to be good stewards of taxpayer dollars.
5. Consider impacts to communities surrounding the SR 37 corridor.
6. Look at the project objectively, while representing your organizations. Should develop metrics to determine if this is being accomplished.
7. Need to look at regional impacts to traffic, environment and air quality.
8. Keep transparency throughout the process.
9. Information sharing is key. Our charge is to take accurate information back to our communities.
10. Take a larger, big picture view of I-69. Examine if the Tier 1 route is still applicable nearly ten years after the decision. Do your due diligence.
11. Hope the Tier 1 decision is confirmed. There are concerns about how Johnson County’s infrastructure can be preserved and improved.
12. Johnson County is committed to the best route for the community.
13. Do not allow political influence determine the selected alternative.
14. Future economic impacts should be considered, not just current impacts.
15. The SWG should be focused on planning and engineering discussions and decisions.



III. Considerations Outside Tier 1 Corridor:

What goals should INDOT & FHWA consider important for I-69 Section 6? What considerations should INDOT and FHWA take into account when determining if alternatives outside the approved Tier 1 Corridor will be evaluated?

1. Shelby and Johnson Counties and the City of Greenwood have made significant investments with the understanding I-69 would be constructed on SR 37. These include the E/W connector, Fairland Rd (I-74) to I-65/Worthsville Road, and other projects.
2. City of Martinsville has also made signification east/west connectivity improvements.
3. Preferred Alternative should have the lowest social impact.
4. INDOT should maximize economic opportunity for I-69.
5. Quality of life and social impacts must be considered when considering looking outside the Tier 1 corridor.
6. Develop pros and cons of following the existing SR37.
7. Need to consider “lessons learned” from Section 5 and other Sections of I-69.
8. Consider time and cost savings of alternatives on and outside the Tier 1 corridor.