



MEETING SUMMARY - DRAFT

Date: March 13, 2018
Time: 9-11 a.m.
Meeting: Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #1
Location: Indiana State Museum

**Complete attendee list begins on page 10*

1. Welcome

Emily Kibling opened the meeting by thanking Community Advisory Committee (CAC) members in attendance. Andy Dietrick with the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) then made opening remarks and provided a brief update on the project.

2. Introduction of Project Team & CAC Members

Project Team – Several representatives from the Project Team were present (*see attendee list at end of document*)

CAC Members – 56 CAC members were present (*see attendee list at end of document*)

3. Purpose of Meeting (see attached presentation)

The purpose of this initial CAC meeting is to provide an overall project update and begin the engagement process with these key stakeholder groups.

4. Brief Update (see attached presentation)

INDOT is initiating an update of the existing interchange where I-65 and I-70 meet on the northeast side of downtown Indianapolis. The North Split Project will provide the opportunity to improve operations and efficiency for all users. The required federal environmental review is beginning now, and as this process progresses INDOT will conduct a robust public outreach plan. It's important to note that many factors and alternatives will be studied.

5. Role of the CAC (see attached presentation)

The CAC will meet approximately six times over the next two years at project milestones to provide input throughout the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. The CAC serves as a sounding board for study information and choices, facilitates collaborative problem solving and discussions of specific issues, and serves as a link to the community by sharing project information.

The North Split Project CAC is made up of a diverse group of engaged voices, including representatives from government, neighborhoods, business, tourism, retail, environmental interests, special interest groups, utilities, facility users, and education institutions.

Based on each CAC member's background, the type of input they provide is unique. For example, someone in business may provide input on how the project will affect its commuters. Neighborhoods can weigh in on how the project impacts residents. Tourism groups may offer insight on how the project will impact their activities and whether they have concerns about the time of year construction occurs.

Anticipated CAC meeting points for the North Split Project include:

- Project Introduction (today)
- System Level Analysis (2018)
- Project Level Alternatives Screening (2018)
- Traffic Maintenance/Project Update (2019)
- Preferred Alternative/Mitigation (2019)
- Public Hearing (2020)

There are many benefits to having a CAC on a transportation project. The CAC allows for consistent communication, better understanding of stakeholder issues, detailed discussion of key issues, the opportunity to hear different views and for collaborative problem solving, and the opportunity to build understanding and support throughout the project.

6. Project Overview (see attached presentation)

The North Split Project is currently early in the NEPA phase.

The preliminary planning documents that are circulating do not identify a preferred alternative. The Project Team is not working on the final design of the project.

The need for the North Split Project comes from the fact that the North Split:

- Is the second-most heavily-traveled interchange in the state
- Accommodates more than 214,000 vehicles per day
- Is operating beyond capacity
- Was constructed between 40 and 50 years ago
- Does not meet current design standards

In addition, the existing 32 bridges need rehabilitation or replacement due to structural issues. Deteriorating pavement conditions require constant repair and patching for roadway and shoulders. The current interchange has complex lane change configurations. Congestion and overall safety factor in the need for the project.

7. National Environmental Policy Act (see attached presentation)

NEPA requires federal agencies to assess the environmental effects of their proposed actions prior to making decisions.

The Environmental Assessment (EA) being completed for the North Split Project will summarize studies of impacts on homes, businesses and the natural environment. This includes looking at Cultural Resources such as historic sites and districts, part of the Section 106 process. This also includes Environmental Justice (EJ) which includes minority and low-income populations and conducting specific outreach and engagement to these audiences.

The EA will also evaluate projected changes in noise levels and their effects on local neighborhoods and how to maintain connections to local roads, trails and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The Project Team is gathering input from state, local and federal resource agencies and permitting agencies, including Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

EJ at FHWA means identifying and addressing disproportionately high and adverse effects of the agency's programs, policies and activities on minority and low-income populations to achieve an equitable distribution of benefits and burdens. This includes the full, fair and meaningful participation by all potentially affected communities through all phases of transportation decision making.

The Project Team is creating an EJ Working Group for the North Split Project. The focus of this group will be on EJ-community concerns and will start with identification of potential EJ communities, determining the best outreach methods and understanding the possible impacts. The EJ Working Group will consist of members from the CAC and others from the community such as Mayor's Neighborhood Advocates, local minority and immigrant organizations, faith-based organizations, neighborhood associations, housing authorities, transit providers, minority media outlets, interested citizens and other interested groups.

8. Alternatives Development Process (see attached presentation)

As part of NEPA, the Project Team is investigating a wide range of alternatives in a two-stage screening study. The first stage is a System Level study and the second is a Project Level study. The System Level report will be available this Spring for public review and comment and a public information meeting will follow its release.

As a reminder, currently there is no preferred alternative.

The System Level Study is a large-scale review of alternatives for interstates downtown, considering the full downtown interstate system. The study will evaluate function, impacts and costs. Results will guide the Project Level Screening of the North Split interchange alternatives. That Project Level Screening will then define alternatives for the EA.

During the System Level Study, the Project Team is studying two Travel Demand Management (TDM) measures – interstate diversion and transit. Interstate diversion refers to the ability to increase I-465 capacity and implement actions to divert traffic away from downtown interstates. Transit TDM measures would include making major regional transit investments to reduce travel demand on downtown interstates. The study will also include a variety of Transportation System Alternatives. These include a no-build option, an update of existing interstates including the North Split, and options to replace the existing system with depressed downtown interstates, boulevards with and without tunnels, or new interstate links.

Key questions the System Level Screening is considering include:

- Can we divert high volumes of downtown traffic to I-465?
 - Past studies show most traffic on downtown interstates is local
 - One indicator is peak period traffic, which is primarily home-to-work travel

- I-70 east has the highest peak hour volumes in the state, with 65 percent of that traffic inbound in the morning
- I-65 from the south is 70 percent inbound in the morning
- How will local and neighborhood streets be impacted?
 - A 2003 Purdue study showed the following impacts when I-65/I-70 was closed during Hyperfix:
 - Pennsylvania Street (south of Fall Creek) saw 46 percent more traffic
 - Delaware Street (south of Fall Creek) saw 112 percent more traffic
 - Fall Creek/Binford (Illinois to 56th) saw 35 percent more traffic
 - College Avenue (Washington to 10th) saw 195 percent more traffic
 - East 10th (10th to Washington) saw 75 percent more traffic
 - West Street (I-65 to I-70) saw 78 percent more traffic
- What would it cost to replace the existing system?
 - Preliminary cost estimate for the North Split Project interchange was \$250 to \$300 million
 - Estimated cost for peer city tunnel/boulevard: \$3.5 billion
 - Plus \$10 million/year for maintenance
 - I-81 in Syracuse, New York (1.6 miles)
 - System Level Screening Study will provide preliminary cost estimates for alternatives

The anticipated schedule for the North Split Project is as follows:

- Summer 2018: System Level Analysis released for public comment, CAC Meeting #2, Public information meeting #1
- Fall 2018: Project Level Alternatives Screening Report released for public comment, CAC Meeting #3, Public information meeting #2
- 2019: Section 106 process, additional public information and CAC meetings
- 2020: Public hearing, NEPA process complete, contractor selected/final design/construction begins

9. Public Involvement (see attached presentation)

INDOT is committed to a robust public involvement plan for the North Split Project. This includes outreach to numerous stakeholders such as neighborhoods, employers, local and state officials. Public involvement activities include a project website, social media, text alerts and e-newsletter, media relations, public meetings, the CAC and presentations to local groups and key stakeholders.

10. CAC Feedback

Comments are due by March 27, 2018. The project team is looking for feedback on CAC meeting times and locations, EJ Working Group members and any general project concerns.

Alternatives are under development and will be presented at a later meeting for review and comment.

11. Question and Answer Period

Andy Dietrick opened the question and answer period by asking the event-focused members in attendance to share their timelines and overall thoughts. He mentioned that construction season is anticipated to begin in 2020 and that an anticipated end date isn't known at this point.

CAC members shared the following comments:

- From my experience and knowledge, folks visiting Indianapolis for our events are getting downtown by driving as opposed to flying in. If construction season is March-September and that infrastructure is taken out of commission for one to three years, that impacts us greatly.
- Our event schedule begins in February 2021, right in the middle of construction.
 - The Project Team followed up with a question about whether the event attendees stay in one place once they get downtown. The CAC Member shared that this is somewhat true for Black Expo but for the Summer Celebration event people are going all around
- This is going to have a huge impact on Banker's Life, Victory Field, traffic patterns, the stadium and all major events happening 2020-2021. Colts season is August-January. This is a huge concern for us on how we're going to move this traffic. You're talking 200-300,000 people.
- Some of the major projects we have going on are the Red Line, going north to south. This should be operational by June of next year. In Lawrence along east 38th street to downtown – the Blue Line. This would be the final project scheduled for 2021. Two thirds of the traffic are commuting to downtown. I don't see a lot in the state for high-occupancy vehicle facilities. We will be increasing our service by 70 percent, helping people find alternatives for transportation.
 - The Project Team commented that the traffic being talked about includes some from other areas, but the destination would be primarily downtown.

Andy Dietrick closed this section by thanking the CAC Members for their feedback and expressed that it is the kind of information needed as the project moves forward. Understanding their needs is very helpful.

The meeting then moved into traditional question and answer format.

- Q: Will you be able to designate where your staging areas will be (during construction)? And let neighborhoods know that in advance? *(CAC Member)*
- A: There is a lot of wide open space within the interchange for staging. Staging details are ultimately worked out during construction, but contractors do often contact property owners in the area directly. Once a contractor has been selected, they may choose to work with nearby property owners on staging areas. INDOT will stay involved and be able to relay that information. *(Project Team)*
- Q: We are wanting some assurance. We all know about assumptions. When you come out to the neighborhoods and address the boulevard alternative you compare it to the boulevard alternative in Syracuse. That cost seems like it could be highly different. The Syracuse project runs up cost because of the bedrock. Will you do a cost analysis on that? *(CAC Member)*
- A: Yes, we will look at function, cost and impact specifically for this project. *(Project Team)*

Q: Are you going to do a full economic analysis? INDOT knows what it's going to cost to build a road, will the project team go beyond this and find out the benefits for the rest of the city? Find more opportunity for development? How did they justify the project in Syracuse, what it would do for the city? *(CAC Member)*

A: That kind of economic analysis is not mandated. *(Project Team)*

Q: Is there a proposed budget for the project? What are the funding sources? I'm trying to get an idea of what INDOT has the stomach for. *(CAC Member)*

A: The original project included rehabilitation of bridges, updating technology, fixing the North Split interchange. The budget for that - \$250-300 million is what was slated. As we get into other alternatives, numbers will be different.

Every penny in INDOT's current budget is spent. For any major change in what that 20-year plan includes, something must go away. Some of those conversations are political or financial. This project is fully funded through the Next Level plan. *(Project Team)*

Q: I would expect that your focus would be to divert all transportation around Indy, what about trucks? Will you be adding capacity other places? There will be streets we would normally use that won't be available, we will likely be on roads where people don't normally see trucks. *(CAC Member)*

A: That kind of information isn't available yet. We don't even have a preferred alternative. *(Project Team)*

Q: One of our concerns is from when you first built the highway and split our neighborhoods. Our neighborhood is one of the roughest neighborhoods in the city now. We've recently seen a revival, part of that reason is we are right there by the trails. What kind of plan is in place to make sure we still have the connectivity, are you creating a larger overpass? *(CAC Member)*

A: INDOT does not have plans developed. We are considering alternatives, but there are not design plans, and we don't have a preferred alternative.

Because of where we're at in our process, we would like to know your feedback. With your input and recommendations and ideas, we can start the conversation. *(Project Team)*

Q: The city of Carmel has done a considerable amount of transportation construction in recent years. We've also invested a lot of money into the Monon, so during those construction timeframes we've always asked for a detour route. Is this something that will be kept in mind for this project? *(CAC Member)*

A: Yes, the same conversations are happening right now, those connectivity conversations are important, having a clear idea of what you want during and after construction. *(Project Team)*

Q: The trains that are coming through 10th Street are a public safety issue. The trains are a huge issue and will complicate this project. Are you considering that? *(CAC Member)*

A: We've heard this and are keeping that in mind. We understand the trains are coming five times a day, if not more. *(Project Team)*

Q: As the team evaluates the alternatives such as the boulevard and it's screening – is the team not evaluating potential economic or community development? If that research isn't being done at an INDOT level, who does that? *(CAC Member)*

A: That's correct. For the NEPA process a full economic study isn't completed. For some projects, interested parties do this research themselves. If this was a P3 (Public-Private Partnership), the Indiana Finance Authority may do it, but it is not.

It's important to clarify that with the system level study, our ultimate interest is what to do with the North Split interchange. This is not going to be the end-all study for all downtown interstates. There will be value in the facts and information coming out of the screening study. *(Project Team)*

Q: Where is the funding coming for this project? *(CAC Member)*

A: This is a fully funded project through INDOT's Next Level Program. *(Project Team)*

Q: Especially on the western most border, is there anything in the pre-planning about the hazardous materials contamination? Or a requirement for a cover for trucks? Are you planning for some type of protection? There will be dust everywhere, so I think there should be a rule to minimize dust. *(CAC Member)*

A: We are working with the INDOT Hazardous Materials Section and the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM), we will be doing soil testing. If there is contamination something will have to happen, I don't know a lot about trucking cover laws, but that could be a requirement for the contractor. *(Project Team)*

Q: Regarding the economic impact analysis, if the city wanted to do some sort of analysis what is the timeframe that would need to happen? *(CAC Member)*

A: We would welcome additional study results at any point in the process. *(Project Team)*

Q: How can economic development not be a metric that you are considering? Shouldn't INDOT be concerned? *(CAC Member)*

A: There could be 10 interpretations of economic studies. There is no doubt about the economic impact of the interstates with 25 ramps going in and out of downtown. All NEPA studies address economic benefits in some manner.

We're looking at an existing facility where the needs are deterioration of bridges and pavement, an interchange that is congested, and probably a safety issue. It's a transportation need. We're more than happy to look at anything that is presented to us. *(Project Team)*

Q: There is a tolling study that should be done by the end of this year. Tolling will dramatically affect the demand and needs of the interstate. Are you taking tolling into account? Are you considering autonomous vehicles? How can those be reconciled? *(CAC Member)*

A: Yes, we have considered many of the items you mention in our study. If you would like us to consider tolling, please make a written public comment. Part of the value of CAC interaction is knowing what is important to you. *(Project Team)*

- Q: If INDOT and FHWA have the final call and we aren't voting, if we do start to see suggestions going in a direction that is contrary to our particular view, how would we proceed if we're not happy? We wouldn't want our name on something that doesn't fulfill our needs. *(CAC Member)*
- A: An important purpose of the CAC is we rely on you to bring items we should consider. We need your help. If something becomes uncomfortable and you no longer want to participate, certainly I think we can have that conversation.
- Documentation is important. The minutes will show that. That will appear in all the documentation on the project, bringing up the concerns is what we need and it's what Seth and Kia need to do their studies. *(Project Team)*
- Q: Regarding EA vs. EIS – is that based on the North Split Project itself? *(CAC Member)*
- A: EA is based on the interchange project. It's possible that an EIS could be done if something different is recommended as part of the system level screening study. *(Project Team)*
- Q: Is there a consideration of the condition prior? Will you assess environmental impact on a non-interstate? *(CAC Member)*
- A: We will acknowledge, but our comparison right now is based on what is currently there now. *(Project Team)*
- Q: Our research indicates the environmental document could start with conditions before the interstates were present. Can you have this discussion? *(CAC Member)*
- A: Yes, we will discuss that with INDOT and FHWA staff. *(Project Team)*
- Q: I just want to clarify, that just because we're a member of the CAC, this doesn't mean we endorse the outcome of the project? *(CAC Member)*
- A: That's correct. We're just looking for advice throughout the process. *(Project Team)*
- Q: The big question is, many of us see it as much bigger than just a transportation issue. There are economic issues, livability issues. It's a much bigger vision than just a transportation issue. How do we marry those with yours? How do we meet both of our goals? What can we do to meet all goals? *(CAC Member)*
- A: We are looking for ways to meet in the middle, we're considering your comments as part of our study, it's not something that we are ignoring. You've taken some very good first steps forming a coalition. We seem to agree we have an aging asset in need of quick attention. *(Project Team)*
- Q: One of the comments and asks I have is on behalf of the five historic districts. I know I would like to have a one-on-one meeting with your team with key stakeholders in the neighborhoods. Our office may be involved in Section 106, so I'd like to have a meeting. How do I go about that? *(CAC Member)*
- A: Please coordinate with Emily and she can set something up. *(Project Team)*
- Q: I'm interested in getting everyone's contact information. Could you share the email list? *(CAC Member)*

A: We will send out the attendee contact list. If you do not want your information included, please let me know. *(Project Team)*

Q: How long until our next meeting? *(CAC Member)*

A: When the system level report is complete, probably in June. I will post these slides to the website and share via email. *(Project Team)*

Q: As far as best practices for cities, is INDOT doing a comprehensive scan of looking at other cities? If you could unpack what the methodology is for carrying out this what would it be? To what extent is it driven by? How many cities do you look at? *(CAC Member)*

A: Any good engineering study considers others' experiences. We've done work in other states, too. I don't have an exact number – under 100 but more than 20. We will do our due diligence. *(Project Team)*

Q: With your current planning schedule and anticipated 2020 construction start, when does the direction of the final plan get set? *(CAC Member)*

A: The System Level Analysis results will help set that direction and the public will have a chance to review and comment when we get to that point.

The System Level Analysis will likely be released in June, with the Project Level Screening Report in the fall. *(Project Team)*

Throughout the question and answer time, some CAC members shared general comments/thoughts with the group which are included below.

- These conversations are happening in a silo, by the time the train has left the station, it's too late for an economic study. The sooner that the information gets out about the plan, whether it's the alternative or the options, the better. *(CAC Member)*
- We've got commuters. I would ask INDOT, as you consider alternatives, please try to approach the project in way that produces the shortest construction time as possible. *(CAC Member)*
 - The Project Team explained that the original project was a series of bridge rehabs. Then INDOT realized that if they package up 32 bridges and an interchange into one larger project, they will get somebody in here who can do it in the quickest way. The team explained that constructability is going to be part of the screening process and that traffic studies will be taken into consideration.
- I encourage you to look at the city of Dallas. It's a unique solution in a park setting. Klyde Warren Park. It's a very large park in the middle of downtown. It would be a creative use of meeting interstate needs and public space interaction and really serves as a bridge. *(CAC Member)*
 - The Project Team acknowledged that they have looked at some peer city projects and will add Klyde Warren Park to the list.
- We have a lot of people that like to walk downtown/commute downtown - we want to have as much access as possible. New York and Michigan are not walkable, under the interstates have

not been good, lighting doesn't work, keeping it clean, wide sidewalks. All of these are huge concerns for us. *(CAC Member)*

- I hope that we would involve some of the major hospitals that are in the area, just for people that want to go visit. Most of our concern is that we use that interchange to get downtown and that's a concern. *(CAC Member)*
 - The Project Team explained that there is a separate emergency responder committee with representatives from hospitals, fire, police, public health and safety and others.

12. Adjourn (meeting ended at 11 a.m.)

Emily Kibling concluded the meeting by reminding CAC members to submit feedback by March 27, 2018 and thanked everyone for their time.

Attendees:

| Project Team | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| Michelle Allen | FHWA |
| David Cleveland | Corradino Group |
| Andy Dietrick | INDOT |
| Kia Gillette | HNTB |
| Ali Hernandez | Borshoff |
| Laura Hilden | INDOT |
| Ron Bales | INDOT |
| Emily Kibling | Borshoff |
| John Myers | HNTB |
| Erin Pipkin | Compass Outreach Solutions |
| Jim Poturalski | INDOT |
| Katie Rounds | INDOT |
| Seth Schickel | HNTB |
| Runfa Shi | INDOT |
| Scott Siefker | TSW |
| CAC Members | |
| Suzanne Baker | Hendricks County Plan Commission |
| Andy Beck | Cottage Home Neighborhood |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Bill Benner | Bankers Life Fieldhouse/Pacers Sports & Entertainment |
| Glenn Blackwood | Fletcher Place Neighborhood |
| Jennifer Boehm | IUPUI |
| Paula Brooks | Ransom Place Neighborhood |
| Bruce Buchanan | Cole-Noble Neighborhood |
| Anthony Burke, Jr. | Nora-Northside Community Council |
| Jessica Castellanos | Citizens Energy Group |
| Garry Chillufo | Historic Urban Neighborhoods of Indianapolis |
| Chantee Eldridge | NCAA |
| Mark Fisher | Indy Chamber |
| Burns Gutzwiller | Windsor Park Neighborhood |
| Tim Haak | City of Zionsville |
| Kären Haley | Indianapolis Cultural Trail |
| Charlie Henry | Victory Field/Indianapolis Indians |
| Jen Higginbotham | Holy Cross Neighborhood |
| Jeff Hill | City of Fishers |
| Joe Jarzen | Keep Indianapolis Beautiful |
| Daniel Johnston | City of Greenwood |
| Jeremy Kashman | City of Carmel |
| Jesse Kharbanda | Hoosier Environmental Council |
| Marjorie Kienle | Lockerbie Square Neighborhood |
| Paul Knapp | Interstate Business Group |
| Gary Langston | Indiana Motor Truck Association |
| Mark Lawrance | Indiana Chamber |
| Chelsea Marburger | Meridian-Kessler Neighborhood Association |
| Lawrance McCormack | Cummins |
| Ike McCoy | Mayor's Neighborhood Advocate, Area #9 |
| Russell Menyhart | Strong Indy |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Mark Messick | White River Township |
| Steven Meyer | King Park Development Corporation |
| Ruth Morales | Mayor's Neighborhood Advocate, Area #10 |
| Dan Mullendore | Old Northside Neighborhood |
| Vop Osili | City-County Council |
| Nick Parr | Boone County Plan Commission |
| David Pflugh | Chatham-Arch Neighborhood |
| Kurt Phillips | Mass Ave Merchants Association |
| Chris Pryor | MIBOR REALTOR® Association |
| Meg Purnsley | Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission |
| Christine Ritzmann | Brown County Planning Commission |
| Philip Roth | Central Indiana Regional Transportation Authority |
| Britni Saunders | State of Indiana Personnel Department |
| Sherry Seiwert | Downtown Indy, Inc. |
| Sarah Stegmeyer | Indiana Restaurant and Lodging Association |
| Meg Storrow | Indiana Landmarks |
| Paul Suiters | Lucas Oil Stadium/Indiana Convention Center |
| Michael Terry | IndyGo |
| Margo Tucker | Citizens Action Coalition |
| Ryan Vaughn | Indiana Sports Corp |
| Amy Waggoner | Salesforce |
| Alice Watson | Black Expo |
| Beth White | Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee |
| Dr. Eugene G. White | Martin University |
| Bob Whitt | Sun King Brewing |
| Mark Zwoyer | Indianapolis Department of Public Works |