



## MEETING MINUTES

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

Perry Meridian High School  
401 W. Meridian School Road, Indianapolis, Indiana  
November 30, 2015 from 4:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m. EDT

Attendee	Organization
Pat Andrews	Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations
John Ayres	Hendricks County
Bob Babcock	IN Railroad Company
Lindsey Beckman	Morgan County Economic Development Corporation
Anne Bono	Hoosier Voices for I-69
Bill Boyd	Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations
Stephanie Belch	Indianapolis MPO
Shannetta Giffin	Indianapolis Airport Authority
Justin Groenert	Southwest IN Chamber of Commerce
Kenny Hale	Morgan County
Liz Irwin	Smithville Fiber
Dr. Thomas Little	Perry Township Schools
William Long	Center Grove School Corporation
David Marcotte	Mooreville School Corporation
Luke Mastin	Johnson County
Steve Oschman	Greater Mooreville Advisory Committee
Greg McKelfresh	South Central Indiana REMC
Cheryl Morpew	Johnson County Development Corporation
Mike Pelham	Johnson County
Jeremy Pell	White River Township Fire Department
Paul Peoni	City of Greenwood
Tony Perona	Town of Plainfield
Jeff Quyle	Morgan County Council
Joe Tutterrow	Morgan County Parks and Recreation
Ron West	Johnson County
Marc Westfall	Perry Township Schools
Sarah Rubin	INDOT
Jim Earl	INDOT
Katie Rounds	INDOT
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA
Robert Dirks	FHWA
Bill Wiedelman	HNTB Corporation
Tim Miller	HNTB Corporation
Kia Gillette	Lochmueller Group



- I. Introductions
  - a. Introduction of Project Team; members of the Project Team will be available to answer questions at the public meetings
  - b. Introduction of CAC and SWG members
- II. Purpose of the Meeting
  - a. Share information on the 5 preliminary alternatives
  - b. Discuss activities since last meeting and next steps
  - c. Gather comments on the preliminary alternatives; comments are due by December 17
  - d. Presentation is the same as what will be shown at the public meetings on November 30, December 2 and 3
- III. Presentation, Table and Maps
  - a. INDOT gave a PowerPoint presentation discussing the 5 preliminary alternatives, discussed a table of performance measures and environmental impacts, cost comparison bar chart and showed alternative maps.
- IV. Discussion and Questions
  - a. Will all 5 preliminary alternatives be carried forward in the DEIS?
    - i. No, it is not anticipated that all 5 alternatives will be carried into the DEIS. The team will be using cost, environmental impacts, performance measures and public comments to refine the number of alternatives. The DEIS will identify the preferred alternative.
  - b. Do you have a maximum number of reasonable alternatives?
    - i. No, the data and information will drive the decision-making process.
  - c. For Alternatives B and D that use I-70, would improvements be needed on I-70?
    - i. Yes, some improvements on I-70 from the tie-in to SR 267 are anticipated. These improvements are anticipated to occur in the median and no additional right-of-way is anticipated along I-70.
  - d. At the previous CAC/SWG meeting we discussed trying to make the travel time performance measure more clear on the table. Was this done?
    - i. The No Build travel time was included in the table and a footnote was added explaining that travel times are based on the shortest path chosen by a typical driver, not necessarily using I-69.
  - e. On the table, the property impacts are listed in acres. Are relocations included at this stage of the study?
    - i. Structure relocation estimates are also included in the table, but are considered estimates at this point. In addition the relative cost comparisons include property impacts (with consideration of location) and relocations.
  - f. On the table, the length of the alternative could be misleading if they all do not stop at the same point on I-465. Should all of the alternatives terminate at the same location?
    - i. The distances of each alternative is to I-465, which was designated as the end point in Tier 1. The length of Alternatives B/D include up to I-70 and then the distance on I-70 to the I-465/I-70 interchange. The Tier 1 selected corridor did not define a specific location on I-465. The travel time savings compares the travel time savings to different locations for the 5 alternatives. This will be clarified in the Screening Report.



- g. When you look at economic benefits, did you look at assessed valuation along the alternatives?
  - i. Specific parcel data was not included in the regional economic analysis. Variances in tax assessments are not within the specifications of the economic model (TREDIS). The TREDIS model was used to estimate increased wages and economic benefits from the interstate.
- h. What is an estimate cost of a bridge over the White River?
  - i. This would vary depending upon the bridge location and length. A rough estimate would be \$5 to \$25 million.
- i. Is the footprint for determining environmental impacts based on a 400-foot width?
  - i. The width is approximately 400 feet wide, but will vary some based on terrain and need to local access roads, grade separations and interchanges. This footprint should be considered preliminary at this time.
- j. What is the cost estimate for Alternative C, which is shown as 100% on the relative cost comparison bar chart?
  - i. There is not an specific cost number at this time because information is still in the preliminary stages. The comparative costs are not anticipated to change but an accurate cost estimate has not yet been completed. This will be done for the reasonable alternatives in the DEIS.
- k. Why is there no SR 37 construction cost shown for Alternative C on the relative cost comparison bar chart?
  - i. Because SR 37 will be I-69 and that cost is shown as the I-69 construction cost. For this comparison, it was assumed about 40% of the existing pavement on SR37 will be reused. The other alternatives may include additional improvements to SR 37 beyond the interstate construction.
- l. How were the potential interchange locations identified?
  - i. Potential interchange locations were based on projected future traffic volumes, public input, safety, and access considerations. INDOT is seeking comment on the proposed locations.
- m. In Martinsville, why does the grade separation at Grand Valley Drive connect to York versus South Street?
  - i. Grade separation locations are still preliminary and we are asking for feedback on them. Martinsville High School prefers a South Street connection. Additional conversations with both entities will likely occur regarding the grade separation at this location. INDOT will coordinate with the school corporation and the City to determine the selected connection.
- n. Why was an interchange at Southport Road chosen for the K Alternatives? This may not make sense if an outer loop is constructed from Southport to the west.
  - i. We are not aware of a planned outer loop in this area and the Indianapolis MPO has not expressed any concerns about the interchange location. This location was chosen due to the bridge over the White River. The team is aware of the potential of extending Southport Road west from Mann Road to High School road.
- o. For Alternatives B and D, the table shows 10 miles of existing interstate. What does this mean?



- i. This includes the portion of the Alternatives that are on I-70, from the tie in at I-70 to I-465.
- p. On the table, for the variations shown in the economic benefits, were these based on the interchange location or number of highway miles?
  - i. These numbers are based on the TREDIS model, not just by the number of interchanges or length. It is a regional benefit for the 4-county study area.
- q. On the relative cost comparison bar chart, is it too early to assume the K Alternatives will be removed due to cost?
  - i. Yes, INDOT wants to present the alternatives to the public and collect public comments prior to the next round of screening.
- r. For the regional economic impact, do you factor in added travel time for people traveling due to roads that are cut off by the interstate?
  - i. No, this is not included. It may be a good idea to have the economic modelers attend the next meeting to provide additional detail on model inputs. The TREDIS model is used nationally for economic modeling.
- s. Could a copy of the presentation be emailed to the CAC/SWG members?
  - i. Yes, this will be emailed after the meeting.

*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.**