



## MEETING SUMMARY

**Date:** May 21, 2018  
**Time:** 9:00 – 10:30 a.m.  
**Meeting:** Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #2  
**Location:** Indiana State Museum, Indianapolis, IN

---

*\*Complete attendee list begins on page 10*

### 1. Introductions

Kia Gillette from HNTB started the meeting by thanking everyone for joining and for participating in the public comment period for the System-Level Analysis. CAC members and Project Team members went around the room and introduced themselves. Kia also clarified that the June 7 public comment deadline is specifically for the System-Level Analysis and that there would be several additional comment periods for the North Split Project.

### 2. System Level Screening Overview

John Myers from HNTB reviewed five main points about the System-Level Analysis of downtown interstates, including that it:

- Was not intended to answer all questions or address all issues
- Focuses on the most basic parameters: performance, cost and impacts
- Analyzed current conditions, not future forecasts
- Was fact finding, not deliberative
- Did not make recommendations or decisions for the future of downtown interstates

John Myers and Seth Schickel, also from HNTB, then walked through the questions received about the System-Level Analysis from CAC members since the May 3 briefing.

#### *Timing-related questions*

**Question (Q):** When is the opening and closing of the public comment period for the North Split Project EA review? How is this different than the System-Level Analysis comment period?

**Answer (A):** The North Split Project will have numerous opportunities for public comment as alternatives are defined and evaluated, and reports are prepared during the next 18 months. The System-Level Analysis was published in May, and its comment period closes on June 7. The North Split comments are part of the required environmental study process. The System-Level

Analysis comments are not associated with a specific decision or action step. They will be compiled and will be available for any group who wishes to study system-level concepts further.

**Q:** What is the process for formally submitting public comment during the EA process?

**A:** Formal comments should be submitted via email to [info@northsplit.com](mailto:info@northsplit.com) or mailed to PO Box 44141, Indianapolis, IN 46244. We will also have hard copy comment cards and a court reporter at public open house events for people to provide input.

The EA and NEPA process for the North Split Project are currently underway and will continue into 2020. During that time, there will be multiple official public comment periods. Those typically occur around key milestones of the project (e.g. release of possible alternatives, selection of preferred alternative). Next up, we anticipate having the purpose and need and alternatives available for public review and comment in summer/fall 2018.

**Q:** Is there a plan for the North Split Project? When will any plan being proposed be shared?

**A:** There is no current plan or design for the North Split Project. A range of alternatives will be defined and evaluated in the upcoming NEPA process. The public will have the opportunity to comment on the alternatives.

**Q:** Can less expensive stabilization work on the whole system be completed to buy time, so that the North Split project and system-level work can all happen at one time?

**A:** Less expensive stabilization work could be conducted on the system while further planning studies are conducted, except where infrastructure needs warrant greater near-term action, such as on the North Split interchange. It is unlikely the complete system would be constructed at one time, however, due to funding and maintenance of traffic constraints.

**Q:** Why was a System-Level Analysis completed only now knowing that the North Split project needed to happen soon?

**A:** A System-Level Analysis is not required by any regulation and not typically completed as part of a NEPA process. It is agreed that a comprehensive, long term plan for downtown interstates would have been useful as the North Split project was undertaken. However, planning for the North Split project has been a multi-year effort (started with recognition of bridge conditions and planning for bridge project, evolved to include/address other needs).

### ***Future study-related questions***

**Q:** If an independent economic investment study is completed, how will it be effectively used and incorporated into planning the system-level work?

**A:** A more extensive planning study would incorporate economic studies and other factors in addition to performance, cost, and impacts of system-level options.

**Q:** Should an EIS be done for all seven concepts or can the options be whittled down to the most logical options?

**A:** A typical approach would be to conduct feasibility studies first, with extensive public and agency involvement, to screen a broad range of options to a smaller number of alternatives for more detailed review. Environmental studies might be conducted for the full system or for individual components, depending on how the work is phased over time.

**Q:** What is the timeline and process for choosing the option for the system?

**A:** A timeline and process for a future plan for downtown interstates has not been defined.

**Q:** How can we be assured that the North Split project does not preclude or prohibit what to do with the rest of the system? Will the state invest money twice into this project within a decade?

**A:** Because alternatives have not yet been defined or evaluated for the North Split, there cannot be assurances of future and potential impacts or changes. This question should be one of many considerations going forward. Even if the state makes a minimal investment now, there is a likelihood that new components will need to be replaced if the system is redefined.

**Q:** Are there options that are being excluded due to effectiveness or funding already, i.e. the basic repair or tunnel/boulevard options?

**A:** The System-Level Analysis does not recommend or exclude any concept. Instead, it investigated concepts, some suggested by the public. INDOT, the City of Indianapolis, the Indianapolis MPO, or other civic organization may use the information going forward.

#### ***Data-related questions***

**Q:** Where can we obtain the actual data used in the System-Level Analysis?

**A:** Specific data requests should follow the formal INDOT Public Records request process (APRA). The request should be sent in writing to [INDOTPublicRecords@indot.in.gov](mailto:INDOTPublicRecords@indot.in.gov).

#### ***Concept-related questions***

**Q:** Concept 2 suggests only 10% through traffic, but it is dismissed because that's not substantial enough. The other options seem to be comparative, so is this being dismissed too soon? Is there a way to incentivize traffic to take other options?

**A:** It was important to estimate potential diversion of through traffic or transit to see whether there would be a major effect on other concepts. These actions should be part of future studies. Note again that none of the options are dismissed in the System-Level Analysis.

**Q:** Why does Concept 4 have so much more ROW than other options except the West Street expansion?

**A:** Depressing the interstate and ramps would require a wider construction area to construct walls, utilities, and other features.

**Q:** Are there ways to combine concepts to increase quality and effectiveness?

**A:** The benefits of combining concepts should be evaluated, along with other options, in future studies of downtown interstates.

**Q:** How much consideration is in these options for increasing opportunities for successful planting and mitigating the change?

**A:** Opportunities for enhancements, vegetation, and other aesthetic improvements are typically considered as part of environmental mitigation and design processes. They can also be considered at a system planning level in terms of potential open space, enhancement of right-of-way, etc.

### ***Traffic-related questions***

**Q:** Since the North Split carries so little through traffic, how is it justified as an interstate?

**A:** Through traffic levels are not a fundamental requirement for interstate highway designation by the Federal Highway Administration.

**Q:** Is the interstate truly at capacity, or is there simply a timing/peak demand issue?

**A:** Portions of the interstate system operate at capacity during certain periods. System planning is typically conducted for peak periods since these demand levels occur every work day throughout the year.

**Q:** How much volume could the city grid carry if it were to be reconnected once the interstate was removed?

**A:** This question is too complex to provide a simple answer. The capacity of the grid would be influenced by the location of origins and destinations, the capacity of individual components, timing of demand, and methods for controlling traffic flow. The travel demand models used in the System-Level Analysis incorporate these and other factors specific to this area in evaluating the system function under various scenarios.

**Q:** Purdue's HyperFix study in 2004 indicated 80% of traffic is through traffic? What is causing such a large disparity between the two studies?

**A:** The System-Level Analysis measured the percent of all peak hour trips on the inner loop that were through trips. There is no disparity with the through traffic survey in the Purdue study because the two reports were measuring entirely different things.

This portion of Purdue's HyperFix study is reviewing the results of the "through traffic survey" described in the first paragraph of page 8. As stated in the Purdue report, "the through traffic survey targeted drivers who traveled through the Indianapolis area during the project." As such, all the respondents were through travelers. Through travelers were identified as described on page 13, "A through traffic survey was conducted at several Interstate rest areas around Indianapolis on a weekday during the closure period."

The statement on page 13 of the Purdue study, “Nearly 80% of all respondents just traveled through Indianapolis”, appears to be referring to the percent of through commercial vehicles with both origins and destinations outside the Indianapolis area (i.e., somewhere else in Indiana or out of state).

**Q:** Purdue’s 2004 study indicated 89% of commuters were not affected by HyperFix, that 54% of those had to change their route but their commute time remained the same. Doesn’t this indicate our system can absorb a much higher volume of traffic than shown in the system-level study?

**A:** There are numerous differences between HyperFix and the current concepts. Only a small part of the downtown interstate system was closed. The north and south legs were fully operational, and most of the ramps of the east leg remained open. All local roadways continued to flow unimpeded under the interstates to enter and leave downtown. The north and south junction interchanges also remained open.

HyperFix was of interest before the Systems-Level Analysis because it demonstrated the importance of evaluating traffic diversion effects on local streets, but its conclusions are specific to that project. The analysis used in the Systems-Level Analysis is much more reliable than a broad estimate based on a single (different) project like HyperFix.

Note that the travel demand model of the Systems-Level Analysis is the same one (albeit updated) used by Purdue in the HyperFix study, as described on page 49.

**Q:** Why is there an urgency to fix the design to deal with volume when the AADT has been basically flat since 1996?

**A:** The urgency in the North Split interchange relates to the physical condition of the pavement and bridges rather than traffic volumes, although the project also provides an opportunity to improve operations as well. The three volume data points since 1996 cited in the question are within 1% of each other, but they vary widely during the period. This is one of the reasons traffic trend data is not used for complex urban projects. Traffic forecasting models for the North Split Project are based on population and employment estimates rather than traffic volume trends.

**Q:** What efforts have been put into carpooling?

**A:** INDOT does not conduct a ridesharing program. Information about ridesharing in Indianapolis is available in the Commuter Connect program of the Central Indiana Regional Transportation Authority (CIRTA).

**Q:** What efforts have been put into alternative work schedules or modified hours?

**A:** Alternative work schedules or modified hours are typically considered in travel demand management (TDM) plans. These have been considered in the past in Indianapolis, typically in individual studies or regionally by the Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). TDM initiatives were not considered the System-Level Analysis.

**Q:** The 2013 INDOT Needs Report includes the statement, “Congestion pricing...works by shifting purely discretionary rush hour highway travel to other transportation modes or to off-peak periods, taking advantage of the fact that the majority of rush hour drivers on a typical urban highway are not commuters. Was congestion pricing evaluated in this project? If a lot of peak traffic is discretionary, it appears there would be room to add disincentives to travel during peak hours.

**A:** Congestion pricing was not considered in the System-Level Analysis. The reference to “purely discretionary rush hour travel” and statement, “the majority of rush hour drivers on a typical urban highway are not commuters” are not consistent with traffic model observations and past planning practice in Indianapolis.

**Q:** How does change of habits and encouraging other options play into the decision for the system-level (e.g. tolling, HOV lanes, redirecting traffic, increased local options such as bike lanes and transit?)

**A:** These factors were not specifically addressed in the System-Level Analysis. They might be considered in more detailed and extensive system-level studies in the future.

**Q:** To what extent is the State working with City Traffic Planners for long-term traffic planning for Center Township and Downtown?

**A:** INDOT routinely works with the Indianapolis Department of Public Works and the Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in planning for Indianapolis transportation facilities. Regional transportation planning is coordinated by the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Council (IRTC), which is administered by the Indianapolis MPO. Bi-weekly meetings were held with the Indianapolis MPO, Indianapolis mayor’s office, Indianapolis DPW, Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development as the System-Level Analysis was being prepared.

**Q:** How does maintaining and increasing traffic flow on interstates at peak time compare to long-term plans for city infrastructure and planned traffic patterns?

**A:** INDOT routinely works with the Indianapolis Department of Public Works and the Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in planning for Indianapolis transportation facilities. Travel demand models and results are shared, and plans are coordinated through the work of the Indianapolis MPO.

**Q:** Do the existing traffic counts include points of entry from within the I-465 outer belt? This might provide information for trips made that could be done on local roads therefore alleviating highway congestion.

**A:** The traffic models used for the System-Level Analysis and other local planning studies consider the trade-offs and sharing of transportation service between local roads and all interstates, including I-465.

### ***Construction-related questions***

**Q:** Will INDOT just rebuild the current system, without any expansion? (North Split question)

**A:** This option will be evaluated in the upcoming NEPA process along with other options for the North Split project.

**Q:** Will INDOT have to acquire the building located at 277 E 12th Street? If so, what does INDOT plan to do with it? Will INDOT do the full environmental impact statement regardless, but especially if demolition is a consideration? Does this require a more rigorous review?

**A:** The impacts of the North Split Project are not known because alternatives are still under development. INDOT will work with FHWA to determine if an EIS is needed based on the impacts of the alternatives.

*A CAC member asked for clarity as to what this building is. The Project Team explained that it's a single-story building that is currently housing a business.*

**Q:** What is the timeline for knowing how much existing green infrastructure will be lost with the North Split development?

**A:** We anticipate North Split alternatives will be defined and presented for public review in late summer/fall of 2018. The alternative(s) will continue to be refined and impacts identified through 2019, with numerous opportunities for public review.

**Q:** When I-65 is closed this year, will INDOT complete any traffic counts for travel diverted along I-465 during that time? Is there anything looked at during this project that might influence or inform the System-Level review?

**A:** INDOT is currently considering options for monitoring traffic during the upcoming I-65 temporary closure. Information learned could be a factor in evaluating temporary or permanent closures in the future.

John Myers then opened it up for any final questions from the group in response to what they just heard.

**A CAC member asked about expansion and why there must be added lanes.**

The project team explained that they aren't at a point in the project to know whether there will be added lanes yet, and that those considerations will come out of the North Split analysis which will happen in the next four to six weeks.

**A CAC member said the expansion footprint seems like it may involve expanding the right-of-way. They asked if the team if the added capacity they mentioned needing could happen without changing the structure or adding additional lanes.**

The Project Team said the answer is maybe. The footprint and right-of-way needs of alternatives, if any, will not be known until the alternatives are defined.

**A CAC member asked for the team to clarify the AADT numbers. They asked if the numbers in the System-Level Analysis were based on flat projections for the future and what data was used.**

The Project Team said they used existing traffic levels in the System-Level Analysis. No projections were developed.

### **3. System-Level Screening Overview Breakout Sessions**

For this portion of the meeting, CAC members were divided into eight groups paired with individuals representing organizations with similar interests (e.g. government, neighborhood, tourism). Each group talked through the following questions:

- Are there any follow-up questions you have about the System-Level Analysis of the downtown interstates?
- What were your key takeaways from the System-Level Analysis?
- How do you think the various concepts in the System-Level Analysis would impact your organization and key stakeholders (positively or negatively, and can that impact be quantified)?
- As a transportation agency, INDOT accommodates the traffic needs across the region and state. INDOT recognizes that long-term vision planning will take time and regional effort. What concepts from the System-Level Analysis do you think should be studied in greater detail by the city, MPO or any other civic organization?

Then, each group reported back to the larger group and shared key takeaways from their discussions:

- **Group #1 (Government/Municipalities - Indianapolis)**
  - The Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission is important to this project, so it was recommended to follow up with them soon and begin initial meetings
  - Would have liked to see crash statistics in the System-Level Analysis and additional information on the conditions and ages of each bridge
  - Would like to look at more of the through traffic information
  - More conversations are needed on long-term decisions, potential impacts to organizations
  - More partnerships need to form in the future
- **Group #2 (Government/Municipalities – Surrounding Cities)**
  - Can look to Fishers and Carmel for examples of freeways and local streets coming together
  - While the System-Level Analysis looked at overall traffic operations, would like to really capture whether local streets could handle increased traffic
  - Rule out concepts that are too costly or appear to make traffic worse
  - Connectivity isn't spelled out in the System-Level Analysis



- Discussion about System-Level Analysis needed to identify impacts to neighborhoods further out
- Further studies are needed on air quality, concepts with more congestion
- Delays are a concern
- Concept 3 should be carried further
- Concept 4 cost is higher, and every dollar spent is a dollar that cannot be spent in their communities
- **Group #3 (Neighborhoods)**
  - There is concern or confusion about what happens next with System-Level Analysis, with the seven concepts
  - There is a general concern about public input moving forward
  - Feeling that quality of life issues were not considered
  - This is a traffic-based study
  - This group wants economic impact and connectivity studies carried further; more study is needed overall
  - Do not want walls
  - Curious as to what can be done to discourage cars from using their roads
  - CSX must be involved
- **Group #4 (Neighborhoods)**
  - Similar concerns as Group #3
  - Interested in an economic impact analysis
  - Discussion regarding urgency for North Split project, focusing on the North Split project and why this was not addressed sooner
  - Additional studies will be prudent
- **Group #5 (Special Interest Groups)**
  - Would like to consider downtown and residential trends; more people are working and living downtown now
  - Curious whether INDOT thought about future trends like automated vehicles; could be studied further and added into another study
  - Safety wasn't mentioned in System-Level Analysis
  - Interested whether this project could be used to find some indicators on traffic patterns
  - Surprised at low level of operational change in the concepts compared to what's existing today
  - Curious whether there is the potential to increase capacity on downtown roads
  - When local street impacts are discussed, are they focused on specific locations?
  - Curious why the depressed alternative showed an increased ROW footprint
  - Opportunity for adjacent development
- **Group #6 (Utilities/Facilities/Schools)**
  - Need to identify who leads the charge and what must be done as far as funding
  - How realistic is it to move forward with some of these concepts?
  - Get a better understanding of how each concept affects bicyclists
  - Overall, agree anything that makes Indianapolis more attractive to tourists, students, etc. is best

- What concepts can we combine rationally?
- **Group #7 (Events/Tourism)**
  - Confusion around who owns further study and what it means when it's done
  - Understanding what quality of life means and how to study it further (the feel of downtown, experience walking downtown under bridges, public art, how to navigate around the city)
  - Interstate brings people here for events which is an important part of our tourism industry
  - How construction impacts getting people downtown is crucial
  - Partnerships should be formed to determine what other players can bring to the table
- **Group #8 (Businesses/Business-Serving Organizations)**
  - Can you depress part of the system without doing all of it?
  - How do we keep connectivity no matter what concept is chosen?
  - Broader commuter tax discussion
  - Could there be a plan to just stabilize bridges, then take the time to do a longer study?

#### 4. Preliminary North Split Project Schedule

Kia Gillette briefly walked through the preliminary schedule for the North Split project to showcase the various opportunities for public involvement. (*see presentation for graphic with dates*)

#### 5. Closing

The meeting concluded with a reminder of the June 7 comment period and reminder of the public open house on May 23 from 3-7 p.m. at the Biltwell Event Center.

#### Attendees:

Project Team	
David Cleveland	Corradino Group
Andy Dietrick	INDOT
Kia Gillette	HNTB
Ali Hernandez	Borshoff
Laura Hilden	INDOT
Ron Bales	INDOT
Jennifer Dzwonar	Borshoff

Emily Kibling	Borshoff
Scott Manning	INDOT
Laura Morales	HNTB
Mike Murphy	Hirons
John Myers	HNTB
Chad Nierman	INDOT
Erin Pipkin	Compass Outreach Solutions
Jim Poturalski	INDOT
Katie Rounds	INDOT
Seth Schickel	HNTB
Runfa Shi	INDOT
Scott Siefker	TSW
Ron Taylor	TSW
Sam Wiser	TSW
<b>CAC Members</b>	
Andy Beck	Cottage Home Neighborhood
Glenn Blackwood	Fletcher Place Neighborhood
Jennifer Boehm	IUPUI
Paula Brooks	Ransom Place Neighborhood
Anthony Burke, Jr.	Nora-Northside Community Council
Garry Chillufo	Historic Urban Neighborhoods of Indianapolis
Bryan Corbin	Eiteljorg Museum
Sandy Cummings	Marion County Public Health Department
Marsh Davis	Indiana Landmarks
Mark Fisher	Indy Chamber
Tricia Frye	Indianapolis Public Schools
David Greene	Indianapolis' Concerned Clergy
Anna Gremling	Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization

Burns Gutzwiller	Windsor Park Neighborhood
Kären Haley	Indianapolis Cultural Trail
Pete Haupers	St. Joseph Neighborhood
Jen Higginbotham	Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization
Jeff Hill	City of Fishers
Barbara Hunt	Indiana Motor Truck Association
Joe Jarzen	Keep Indianapolis Beautiful
Jeremy Kashman	City of Carmel
Marjorie Kienle	Lockerbie Square Neighborhood
Paul Knapp	Interstate Business Group
Ted Mau	Cole-Noble Neighborhood
Lawrance McCormack	Cummins
Russell Menyhart	Strong Indy
Mark Messick	White River Township
Dan Mullendore	Old Northside Neighborhood
David Pflugh	Chatham-Arch Neighborhood
Meg Purnsley	Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission
Christine Ritzmann	Brown County Planning Commission
Philip Roth	Central Indiana Regional Transportation Authority
Jordan Ryan	North Square Neighborhood
Michael Terry	IndyGo
Amy Waggoner	Salesforce
Beth White	Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee
Dr. Eugene G. White	Martin University
Bob Whitt	Sun King Brewing
Dehna Williams	Brightwood-Martindale Neighborhood
Scott Wilson	Holy Cross Neighborhood
Mark Zwoyer	Indianapolis Department of Public Works

<b>Non-CAC Members</b>	
Zach Adamson	City-County Council
Hilary Barnes	Old Northside Neighborhood