



## MEETING SUMMARY

**Date:** May 21, 2018  
**Time:** 6:00 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.  
**Meeting:** Consulting Parties Meeting #3  
**Location:** Indiana State Museum, Indianapolis

---

*\*Complete attendee list begins on page 7*

### 1. Introductions

Kia Gillette from HNTB started the meeting by thanking everyone for joining. Consulting Parties and Project Team members went around the room and introduced themselves as did those who participated via phone.

### 2. System-Level Analysis Overview (see attached presentation)

Kia Gillette and John Myers, also from HNTB, walked attendees through a presentation that overviewed the System-Level Analysis and provided details on each concept.

The Project Team then opened the Question and Answer portion of the meeting.

### 3. Question (Q) and Answer (A) Period

The Question and Answer portion of the consulting parties meeting was a time for consulting party members and members of the public to ask questions. The Project Team provided responses. Consulting party members and members of the public were also able to make comments for the public record during this time.

#### **(Q) What will happen as part of the North Split project and how will the System-Level Analysis guide the project?**

(A) The System-Level Analysis looked at the entire downtown interstate system, recognizing that the North Split has the urgent need to be addressed. The team is just now starting to develop alternatives for the North Split interchange. Through the Environmental Assessment (EA), which is approximately a two-year process, a range of alternatives will be presented, then those will be narrowed down, and finally a preferred alternative will be selected. The Project Team reiterated they do not know what the preferred alternative will be, and there will be multiple opportunities for public involvement throughout the process.

**(Q) How does the \$250 million currently allocated for the North Split project compare to the costs shown in the System-Level Analysis. Specifically, how much larger are the footprints of those concepts compared to the North Split.**

(A) The physical boundaries are very different. The System-Level Analysis examined the entire downtown interstate system. INDOT does not currently have money budgeted for the entire system. The cost ranges in the analysis do not represent budgeted and funded costs but rather represent estimated costs for the concept in the entire system. The North Split project is already budgeted and funded.

**(Q) Is the budgeted cost for the North Split to simply fix what's currently there?**

(A) The budget is based on the upgrade option INDOT was considering in 2016. Other alternatives are currently being developed. The final cost may be less or more than the \$250-\$300 million, depending on what the preferred alternative includes.

**(Q) Something must be done because there is a safety issue, so is the No-Build a real option and why there is no cost associated with it in the comparison chart?**

(A) The No-Build concept was looked at because it's a requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and it provides a point of comparison. The No-Build includes projects that are already planned and funded. For example, work will be done this summer on a handful of bridges in the North Split to put band-aids on them as the NEPA process is completed. There would be dollars spent in the No-Build, but it would only be planned projects.

**(Q) What items are included in the maintenance costs in the No-Build?**

(A) Over time with a No-Build situation, INDOT would still have to do some maintenance work. Travel lanes would have to close to do this work. There would be impacts to traffic. For the North Split alternatives, the No-Build option will carry a zero construction dollar cost because it will only include planned projects with already programmed costs.

**(Q) Is there is a difference between the No-Build – or doing nothing/doing no harm – and stabilizing for a period of time?**

(A) As the North Split alternatives are developed, there will be a No-Build option, as well as options that include just replacing what is already there. Alternatives will be presented at a future meeting.

**(Q) Will the North Split remain the exact same as it is today? There is concern over more noise, higher walls, and a larger footprint with more lanes.**

(A) The Project Team reiterated that they are currently in the process of developing alternatives. The Consulting Parties will know details about the alternatives once they are available.

**(Q) What is the band-aid work on the bridges mentioned earlier?**

(A) Within the North Split there are 32 bridges and late this summer INDOT will be doing maintenance on seven of them. The fixes being performed will allow INDOT to get a few more years out of the bridges for a nominal cost. This work will get the bridges to the point of doing the complete North Split project.

**(Q) How can the North Split be segmented as a single project and not require a much larger review through the EA to look at the system as an entire project? Since they are linked, how will that be handled from a technical and legal process.**

(A) INDOT must demonstrate that a project has independent utility, or can function by itself. This will be addressed in the Purpose and Need for the project.

**(Q) Can you provide further description of what is meant by “independent utility”?**

(A) Part of FHWA’s decision-making process is to determine whether a project has independent utility, meaning it is a stand-alone project and provides benefits without forcing adjacent projects. In addition, there must be logical termini – a start and an end. Often for interstates the logical termini is from interchange to interchange.

As the team is looking at the North Split, we will be determining what makes sense – whether there is independent utility. The team will ask themselves whether there could be different solutions within the project termini.

Consulting Parties will learn more about the Purpose and Need when it is released to the public. It identifies why a project is being done. The alternatives are developed to meet those needs and solve the problems identified.

**(Q) The North Split will have an impact on historic structures and neighborhoods, and that is a concern. Why expand lanes if the problem being solved is to fix aging bridges? Is expanding traffic necessary?**

(A) No decisions have been made at this point, so it is unknown whether added lanes will be proposed. Alternatives are just now being developed. There is a process to follow. Consulting Parties will have the opportunity to review the alternatives and comment on effects to historic properties.

**(Q) What assumptions was the traffic analysis based on and what time of day is being looked at, because based on what I see from home, Indianapolis only has a rush half-hour?**

(A) The traffic analysis was based on morning and evening peak periods. Traffic counts show the peaks to be longer than one-half hour. Information will be shared as alternatives are developed.

**(Q) Why are the through traffic numbers in the System-Level Analysis around 10 percent when previous materials showed 25-30 percent? Did the location-based services look at a smaller area and that's what skewed the numbers?**

(A) The 25-30 percent was based on a preliminary estimate, not the traffic model used in the System-Level Analysis. The 10 percent surprised the Project Team as well but it was approached using three different methods and each produced the same result. The location-based services data from cell phones used about a 20 percent sample so there could always be a slight variability.

**(Q) How accurate can the traffic model be when looking at options as different as freeway expansion or boulevards?**

(A) The tools used for the System-Level Analysis are the best tools available for analyzing networks with different types of roadways. These models are very effective for looking at different facility types in the same network.

**(Q) Does INDOT plan to study economic development since some of the numbers are so large they are intimidating, and it would be helpful to know what funds could be allocated to each concept through property tax, sales tax, home tax, etc.**

(A) INDOT does not plan to do an economic development study that looks at the redevelopment of excess right-of-way, nor any additional system-level studies. At this point, it is not known who will take the study forward. Economic development is one of many topics that deserves more study.

**(Q) When people attend the public open house and see the \$5.5 billion price tag they will get scared and not understand that there could be creative funding options. Will there be someone on-site to talk about this?**

(A) There will be multiple people at the public open house for people to talk with and ask questions. We hope people will attend the open house and ask questions for a good dialogue. The System-Level Analysis looked at the most basic issues. It was not intended to answer all questions about these concepts. INDOT did not pick or eliminate an option because it recognized an additional study was needed. That study could be led by the City, the Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), or another planning organization.

**(Q) Is it correct that no financial expert or economist reviewed the seven concepts?**

(A) That is correct. Consistent with the intent of the study, specialists looked at performance, cost, and impact which the team believes to be a good start.

**(Q) What percentage of the 10 percent through traffic was traveling to a different state and what is the significance of that number?**

(A) The study did not look at what percentage of through traffic was traveling to a different state. The data was used to get a general idea of how much traffic could be diverted to I-465 and whether that volume would be significant enough allow boulevards, which can handle much less volume than interstates, to function effectively. The data gave a point of reference with respect to these diversion opportunities.

**(Q) The 10 percent number was surprising, could you confirm that if a person entered I-465 from 71<sup>st</sup> Street on the northwest side, traveled on I-70 to the other side of I-465, they wouldn't be counted in that 10 percent? It was noted that a motorist could backtrack only slightly to get around on I-465 and avoid I-70 altogether.**

(A) Some trips could do that. These would not be identified in the first two analysis methods, but the model would account for this option in the third method. There are some offsetting factors in the other direction as well. For instance, it is unlikely that every single through trip would divert to I-465. Most of the numbers were actually lower and were rounded up to 10 percent. The 10 percent is an approximation and point of reference. It is not intended to be precise.

**(Q) Regarding the location-based service data, if a person has a flip phone and drives a FedEx truck through Indianapolis, would that person have been counted? Do non-smartphones get counted?**

(A) No, not every driver is counted. The location-based service data has a 20 percent sampling rate. This is an acceptable percentage for comparison.

**(Q) I was astonished after reading the report and finding a small improvement in performance with the most aggressive expansion (Concepts #3 and #4). Was this a surprise to the Project Team?**

(A) Concepts 3 and 4 are identical in performance, this was not a surprise. The reduction percentage was based on the entire study area – freeways and local roads, not just the interstates. Actual reduction in delay would be more significant in various areas.

**(Q) Recognizing that the Project Intent Report included a plan with more lanes, wouldn't there be a commitment to expand the entire system if expansion occurs in the North Split?**

(A) It is not known at this point whether any expansion will occur. The Project Intent Report was done by INDOT to estimate future funding. The Project Team is now investigating the Purpose and Need, conducting public involvement activities, and developing a range of alternatives. More information will be available once alternatives are developed.

**(Q) Will INDOT look seriously at environmental impacts, economic development impacts, community impacts, and pollution as they move forward with designing alternatives for the North Split? If these are going to be looked at, who will be brought to the table to make those assessments?**

(A) As the project moves into the EA phase, the Project Team will begin looking at a full range of impacts. INDOT works with the Indianapolis MPO, Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM), and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) to determine what air quality studies are required. Connectivity both across and under the interstates will be considered. For aesthetics, the Project Team will look at whether there would be retaining walls, or whether other options can be used. The Project Team includes a range of qualified professionals to assist with these analyses.

**(Q) What about the role of CSX? How does that come into play for what INDOT is doing and how do the two interact?**

(A) The railroad does impact the project as it causes pinch points within the North Split project. INDOT will avoid impacting the railroad.

(A) Consulting Party suggested depressing the interstate on the east side and elevating the CSX rail line to solve the current issues with trains in that area.

**(Q) During HyperFix people survived that closure. Couldn't we simply remove the interstates?**

(A) During HyperFix, only the mainline of the east leg was closed. Many portions of the interstate, including the entire north and south legs of the inner loop and the majority of east leg exits, were still open.

**(Q) What impacts would the system-level concepts have on historical properties?**

(A) The System-Level Analysis looked at direct impacts to historic properties at a high-level but further studies would be needed to better define the impacts. Moving forward with the North Split project, effects to historic properties will be evaluated as part of the Section 106 consultation process.

**Additional comment from a Consulting Party: Overall preference would be the No-Build within the System-Level Analysis. Address safety concerns but slow down the North Split project.**

#### **4. 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:**

| <b>Consulting Parties</b> |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| Alicia Baker              | John Boner Neighborhood Centers                          |
| Glenn Blackwood           | Fletcher Place Neighborhood Association                  |
| Desiree Calderella        | Fountain Square Neighborhood Association                 |
| John Carr                 | IDNR – Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology |
| Garry Chilluffo           | Historic Urban Neighborhoods of Indianapolis (HUNI)      |
| Jeffrey Cristoffersen     | Lockerbie Square People’s Club                           |
| Marsh Davis               | Indiana Landmarks  |
| Pat Dubach                | Holy Cross Neighborhood Association                      |
| Denise Halliburton        | Ransom Place Neighborhood Association                    |
| Pete Haupers              | St. Joseph Neighborhood Association                      |
| Charlie Hyde              | Benjamin Harrison Presidential Site                      |
| Joe Jarzen                | Keep Indianapolis Beautiful                              |
| Jim Jessee                | Cottage Home Neighborhood Association                    |
| Danielle Kauffmann        | IDNR – Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology |
| Marjorie Kienle           | Historic Urban Neighborhoods of Indianapolis             |
| Paul Knapp                | Interstate Business Group                                |
| Jennifer Milikin          | Urban League of Indianapolis                             |
| Patricia Perrin           | Property Owner   |
| Charles Perrin            | Property Owner   |
| Jordan Ryan               | North Square Neighborhood Association                    |
| Tony S.                   | St. Joseph Neighborhood                                  |

| <b>Project Team</b> |                 |
|---------------------|-----------------|
| Michelle Allen      | FHWA            |
| Patrick Carpenter   | INDOT           |
| David Cleveland     | Corradino Group |
| Andy Dietrick       | INDOT           |
| Kia Gillette        | HNTB            |
| Ali Hernandez       | Borshoff        |
| Emily Kibling       | Borshoff        |
| Leah Konicki        | ASC Group       |
| Scott Manning       | INDOT           |
| Laura Morales       | HNTB            |
| John Myers          | HNTB            |
| Anthony Ross        | INDOT           |
| Seth Schickel       | HNTB            |
| Scott Siefker       | TSW             |
| Ron Taylor          | TSW             |