



MEETING MINUTES

Section 6 Stakeholder Working Group (SWG)

Morgan County Division of Family Resources

May 11, 2015 from 1:30-3:30 p.m. EDT

Attendee	Organization
Ross Holloway	City of Martinsville
Larry Smith	Morgan County
Michael Pelham	Johnson County
Travis Underhill	City of Franklin
Julie Young	Town of Bargersville
Mark Richards	City of Greenwood
Sean Northrop (for Anna Gremling)	Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization
John Ayres	Hendricks County
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Kevin Hetrick	INDOT
LaMar Holliday	INDOT
Will Wingfield	INDOT
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	HNTB Corporation
Christine Meador	HNTB Corporation
Tim Miller	Lochmueller Group
Kia Gillette	Lochmueller Group

- I. Introductions
 - a. Introduction of Project team
 - b. Introduction of LaMar Holliday, I-69 Public Information Specialist
- II. Old Business – Activities since our last meeting
 - a. Meeting summary from January 29th CAC Meeting
 - i. Section 6 Project Team
 - ii. Section 6 2015 Schedule
 - iii. Tier 1 Selected Corridor and Potential Additional Alternatives
- III. Activities since Last Meeting
 - a. Public Involvement (PIM, Association Meetings, Project Office)
 - b. Field Work
 - c. Traffic Data – 2045 Travel Forecasting
 - d. Agency Coordination
- IV. New Business
 - a. CAC Chairperson Discussion
 - b. Draft Purpose and Need
 - c. Description of Scoping Process
 - d. Results of Scoping Process
 - e. Conceptual Alternatives



V. Discussion

- a. Is the alternative evaluation part of the outer loop evaluation?
 - i. The outer loop, sometimes referred to as the Commerce Connector, is not affiliated with the Section 6 project – when or if it moves forward it would have its own environmental process separate of I-69.
- b. What is the timeline for reduction of alternatives?
 - i. Alternatives will be presented to the resource agencies, SWG, CAC, and public and comments will be accepted. After consideration of comments, alternatives will be further evaluated and screened through the fall. After that alternatives will be brought back to resource agencies, SWG, CAC, and the public.
 - ii. By the fourth quarter we will have reduced number of alternatives to reasonable alternatives that will be studied in the DEIS.
 - iii. Do not have set number of alternatives which will be considered for reasonable alternatives in DEIS. The only alternative assured to move forward in the DEIS is the upgrade of existing SR 37. The Eastern and Western alternatives will be carried forward if they meet the project's Purpose and Need.
 - iv. We intend for this to be an open process with a reduction of alternatives from preliminary to reasonable.
 - v. The draft Purpose & Need with performance measures will be used to screen alternatives.
- c. Is there data to support WHY the public preferred an alternative especially with regards to the bypass around Martinsville?
 - i. No, some people drew this line on the maps at the February PIM's, so INDOT is gathering conceptual information on its impacts and merits
- d. Clarification that SR 37 will be carried forward as a reasonable alternative regardless of other alternatives. It is possible that after screening, SR 37 is the only reasonable alternative. If this were to be the case, there may be some reduction of the schedule.
- e. Does screening and elimination of alternatives affect schedule.
 - i. It is not anticipated unless all alternatives except for SR 37 are screened out.
 - ii. This year's field activities are concentrated on SR 37 because the SR 37 corridor is being carried forward throughout the NEPA process.
 - iii. Next year, alternatives off SR 37 will be evaluated and have field work performed if they are determined to be reasonable.
- f. How confident are you of the Purpose & Need at this time.
 - i. Purpose & Need has been thoroughly reviewed by Project Team.
 - ii. Resource agencies are currently reviewing and will provide comments in early June.
 - iii. Public comment on Purpose & Need is being accepted until June 2. .
 - iv. Comments from this group and the CAC will be accepted until June 2.



- v. Based on Tier 1 goals and includes scoping process that we have gone through this year.
- vi. Performance measures are critical
 - 1. Traffic congestion
 - 2. Travel time
 - 3. Reduction of crashes
- g. What is the assumed LOS and reduction of congestion?
 - i. Measure of improvement, reduction of vehicle number of miles under congestion.
 - ii. I-69 designed at D for urban, C for rural.
- h. Freight – measurement for commerce congestion
 - i. Vehicle miles per hour for freight will be broken out separately
 - ii. Travel time between intermodal facilities as next step
 - iii. Still refining model
- i. Have secondary costs such as widening of interstate been considered.
 - i. Secondary costs will be considered during the next level of screening.
- j. Clarification that all alternatives evaluated have used a 400 foot corridor and these will continue to be refined in order to reduce impacts.
- k. Clarification that the next refinement of alternative evaluation will consider actual road cross sections which in areas of uneven terrain or hills could be wider than 400 feet.
- l. Request for clarification on areas of low income or minority populations to be considered.
 - i. Area to west side of roadway in Martinsville is potential.
 - ii. INDOT wants to identify populations within study area which may be wider than the 400 foot footprint..
 - iii. INDOT will reach out to communities to make sure that we are inclusive of all communities and meet any special needs a community may have with regards to public involvement.

VI. Information Requested

- a. Low Income/Minority Information
 - i. Request assistance in identifying low income, minority, or special concern populations
 - ii. Areas should include those along alternatives but also areas which may be affected by travel times, access to services
 - iii. We need to make sure we are inclusive of everyone
- b. Comments on Purpose & Need
- c. Comments on Conceptual alternatives
- d. General thoughts or comments
- e. Submit comments by June 2, 2015 (also deadline for public meetings)



Action Item	Responsible Party	Due Date
Provide links to Purpose and Need, Alternative evaluation when posted to website.	INDOT	May 18, 2015
Provide comments on Purpose and Need and Alternative evaluation	SWG	June 2, 2015
Provide information regarding low income, minority, or special needs populations of concern	SWG	June 2, 2015 or as identified

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 Christine Meador at cmeador@HNTB.com.

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



MEETING MINUTES

Section 6 Community Advisory Committee (CAC) South

Morgan County Division of Family Resources

7851 Waverly Road, Martinsville, IN 46151

May 12, 2015 from 1:00-3:00 p.m. EDT

Attendee	Organization
Kevin Brinegar	Indiana Chamber of Commerce
Robert Carter	Martinsville Fire Department
Phil Deckard	City of Martinsville
Justin Groenert	Southwest Indiana Chamber
Liz Irwin	Bloomington Chamber of Commerce
Krista Linke	City of Franklin
Chelsey Manns	Morgan County Economic Development Corporation
Kevin McGinnis	Town of Bargersville
Jack Hubbard	South Central Indiana REMC
Michele Moore	Martinsville Consolidated School Corporation
Jamie Thompson- Taylor	Martinsville Chamber of Commerce
Joe Tutterrow	Morgan County Parks and Recreation
Norman Voyles	Morgan County
Rodger Wiltermood	Martinsville Police Department
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Kevin Hetrick	INDOT
LaMar Holliday	INDOT
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	HNTB Corporation
Christine Meador	HNTB Corporation
Tim Miller	Lochmueller Group
Kia Gillette	Lochmueller Group
Eric Swickard	Lochmueller Group

- I. Introductions
 - a. Introduction of Project team
 - b. Introduction of LaMar Holliday, I-69 Public Information Specialist
- II. Old Business – Activities since our last meeting
 - a. Meeting summary from January 29th CAC Meeting
 - i. Section 6 Project Team
 - ii. Section 6 2015 Schedule
 - iii. Tier 1 Selected Corridor and Potential Additional Alternatives
- III. Activities since Last Meeting
 - a. Public Involvement (PIM, Association Meetings, Project Office)
 - b. Field Work



- c. Traffic Data – 2045 Travel Forecasting
 - d. Agency Coordination
- IV. New Business
- a. CAC Chairperson Discussion
 - b. Draft Purpose and Need
 - c. Description of Scoping Process
 - d. Results of Scoping Process
 - e. Conceptual Alternatives
- V. Discussion
- a. When will field work be completed?
 - i. Field work on SR 37 began this year and will continue throughout this year. Next year, field work will be conducted on other alternatives as needed.
 - b. Does INDOT recognize the financial hardship in the corridor with regards to extending dates of study?
 - i. Reviewed schedule. Identify preferred alternative as part of DEIS.
 - c. Focus of study area on four counties. Is there a component of study that will look at connection to I-69 nationally?
 - i. We recognize large scale project and local impacts. INDOT is aware of the status of I-69 throughout the country.
 - d. Are there any alternatives that extend the entire way to SR 67 at I-465?
 - i. No, it was determined that a system interchange at that location would conflict with the system interchange at I-70 and I-465 and therefore alternatives which extended to I-465 were not advanced for further consideration.
 - e. Would the width in the 400 foot footprint be minimum, maximum, or ideal?
 - i. The 400 foot footprint is our attempt at a reasonable guess with access roads. The footprint will undergo more careful review during the next steps of evaluation.
 - f. Would it be possible that both an east and west route could occur?
 - i. No, one alternative will be identified as the preferred alternative and one alternative will be selected.
 - ii. It is important to note that the Purpose and Need and associated performance measures is very important when comparing alternatives.
 - iii. Can't emphasize importance of alternatives meeting the purpose and need enough.
 - g. What are the Water of the US signs on Section 5?
 - i. These are areas identified by Army Corps of Engineers as waters of the US (streams or wetlands) which require permitting and have to be protected. These signs will likely be used on Section 6 also.
 - h. The CAC suggested it should be made clear that that environmental study includes economic, human environmental, etc. not just natural resources.
 - i. Clarification: The outer loop or Commerce Connector as recommended by the Blue Ribbon Panel was a comment that was also raised. The Commerce Connector is a separate project and will have to move through a similar process. If the Commerce Connector were to move forward it would have to go through the same environmental process as I-69. The Commerce Connector is not a driver for alternative selection. Governor Pence has stated our goals are to



finish what we have started, take care of what we have, and plan for the future. Our goal in this process is to finish I-69.

VI. Information Requested

- a. Low Income/Minority Information
 - i. Need help identifying low income, minority, or special concern populations
 - ii. Areas should include those along alignments but also areas which may be affected by travel times, access to services
 - iii. We need to make sure we are inclusive of everyone
- b. Comments on Purpose & Need
- c. Comments on Conceptual alternatives
- d. General thoughts or comments
- e. Send to us by June 2, 2015 (also deadline for public meetings)

Action Item	Responsible Party	Due Date
Provide links to Purpose and Need, Alternative evaluation when posted to website.	INDOT	May 18, 2015
Provide comments on Purpose and Need and Alternative evaluation	CAC	June 2, 2015
Provide information regarding low income, minority, or special needs populations of concern	CAC	June 2, 2015 or as identified

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 Christine Meador at cmeador@HNTB.com.

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



MEETING MINUTES

Section 6 Community Advisory Committee (CAC) North

Morgan County Division of Family Resources

7851 Waverly Road, Martinsville, IN 46151

May 12, 2015 from 9:00-11:00 a.m. EDT

Attendee	Organization
Bob Babcock	Indiana Rail Road Company
Bill Boyd (Proxy for Pat Andrews)	Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations
Dr. Thomas Little	Perry Township Schools
Shannetta Giffin	Indianapolis Airport Authority
Dr. Frank Giles	Perry Township Schools
Jason Holliday	Marion County
David Holt	Conexus Indiana
Barry Miller	Indiana Motor Truck Association
Dr. William Long	Center Grove School Corporation
Christian Maslowski	Greater Greenwood Chamber of Commerce
Pat Sherman	Johnson County Development Corporation
Mayor Mark Myers	City of Greenwood
Jeremy Pell	White River Township Fire Dept.
Amy Cornell	Indiana Farm Bureau
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Kevin Hetrick	INDOT
LaMar Holliday	INDOT
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	HNTB Corporation
Christine Meador	HNTB Corporation
Tim Miller	Lochmueller Group
Kia Gillette	Lochmueller Group
Eric Swickard	Lochmueller Group

- I. Introductions
 - a. Introduction of Project team
 - b. Introduction of LaMar Holliday, I-69 Public Information Specialist
- II. Old Business – Activities since our last meeting
 - a. Meeting summary from January 29th CAC Meeting
 - i. Section 6 Project Team
 - ii. Section 6 2015 Schedule
 - iii. Tier 1 Selected Corridor and Potential Additional Alternatives
- III. Activities since Last Meeting
 - a. Public Involvement (PIM, Association Meetings, Project Office)
 - b. Field Work



- c. Traffic Data – 2045 Travel Forecasting
- d. Agency Coordination

IV. New Business

- a. CAC Chairperson Discussion
- b. Draft Purpose and Need
- c. Description of Scoping Process
- d. Results of Scoping Process
- e. Conceptual Alternatives

V. Open Discussion and Questions

- a. How does the number of people asking to look outside the SR 37 corridor compare to what we expected?
 - i. Many in Martinsville have indicated they would like I-69 to stay on SR 37
 - ii. There were no expectations regarding the public comments in the February public meetings.
- b. What would the interchange be at existing SR 37?
 - i. We have to maintain the Harding Street interchange
 - ii. The potential new system interchange for the SR37 alternative would be approximately 1,000 feet to the west of the existing interchange. (After the meeting, this dimension was checked and found to be approximately 3,000 feet.)
- c. What are interchange locations along SR 37?
 - i. Interchange locations have not yet been determined.
 - ii. The Tier 1 identified potential interchanges at SR 39, SR 252/44, Egbert Road, SR 144, Smith Valley Road, County Line Road, Southport Road, and I-465.
 - iii. When we get to the point where we identify interchange locations; the CAC, SWG, and the public will be engaged during the identification of potential locations.
- d. Major destinations on the table are downtown, airport, I-69 on north side of Indianapolis. Is there an assignment of priority?
 - i. No, there is no priority.
 - ii. If there is one that is more important let us know.
- e. Why were these alternatives eliminated in Tier 1?
 - i. Looked at them as entire corridor alternative from Evansville to Indianapolis.
 - ii. The Tier 1 looked at the alternatives at a macro level. We are now focusing on specifics within Section 6.
 - iii. Mann Road was an alternative previously not recommended for advancement. It was not advanced due to the potential of wetland impacts and compatibility with Marion County Comprehensive Plan.
 - iv. Most of these alternatives were not investigated as part of Tier 1, only Mann Road was investigated.
- f. With regard to the East Alternatives, why are we concerned about traffic coming to I-65 but not concerned about traffic on I-70?
 - i. I-65 was higher priority as it is already at capacity in the 2045 design year. I-70 could require additional lanes west of SR 267 also but otherwise it has more available capacity.
 - ii. Even if we do not build I-69, I-65 is congested in the 2045 design year.
 - iii. I-70 may require additional lanes if a west alternatives is selected.
- g. Are we considering having community meetings in Perry Township now that SR 37 is back on table?



- i. We can meet with a group in City Township to provide a project update. SR 37 has been on the table since the Tier 1 ROD.
 - h. Can we release Google Earth layers for alternatives?
 - i. The Project Team will investigate this possibility.
 - i. At what point in time do we consider funding?
 - i. Funding study will be evaluated by INDOT in parallel to the EIS as part of this study.
 - ii. We will know additional information about the funding availability closer to the FEIS/ROD.
 - iii. Financial Plan will be developed in late 2017 between DEIS and FEIS/ROD
 - j. Clarification: The outer loop or Commerce Connector as recommended by the Blue Ribbon Panel was a comment that was also raised. We want to be clear that the Commerce Connector is a separate project. We are in a formal EIS process to complete I-69 from Evansville to Indianapolis and the Commerce Connector is not yet at this level of planning. Only projects which are planned and funded are considered in our formal process and traffic models. If the Commerce Connector were to move forward it would have to go through the same environmental process as I-69. The Commerce Connector is not a driver for alternative selection. Governor Pence has stated our goals are to finish what we have started, take care of what we have, and plan for the future. Our goal in this process is to finish I-69.
 - k. Can INDOT better explain the traffic travel times in future meetings? Members of the CAC requested that better clarification for travel time savings to the airport, downtown, and to the northeast side be provided in subsequent meetings and documents. In addition, the CAC requested we better explain how travel time savings are generated.
 - i. INDOT agreed to better explain the travel times in future meetings and documents.

VI. Information Requested

- a. Low Income/Minority Information
 - i. Need help identifying low income, minority, or special concern populations
 - ii. Areas should include those along alignments but also areas which may be affected by travel times, access to services
 - iii. We need to make sure we are inclusive of everyone
- b. Comments on Purpose & Need
- c. Comments on Conceptual alternatives
- d. General thoughts or comments
- e. Send to us by June 2, 2015 (also deadline for public meetings)

Action Item	Responsible Party	Due Date
Provide links to Purpose and Need, Alternative evaluation when posted to website.	INDOT	May 18, 2015
Provide comments on Purpose and Need and Alternative evaluation	CAC	June 2, 2015
Provide information regarding low income, minority, or special needs populations of concern	CAC	June 2, 2015 or as identified
Google Earth Layers	INDOT	Week of May 18, 2015



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 Christine Meador at cmeador@HNTB.com.

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