



INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

MEETING SUMMARY

Date: November 3, 2017

Time: 9:30 – 11:30 a.m.

Meeting: I-65/I-70 North Split Interchange Reconstruction Project – Resource Agency Meeting

Location: HNTB Office, Indianapolis, IN

Attendees (based on sign-in sheet):

Name	Organization	Email
Kia Gillette	HNTB	kgillette@hntb.com
Michelle Allen	FHWA	Michelle.allen@dot.gov
Melody Park	DPW	Melody.park@indy.gov
Dan Parker	DPW	daniel.parker@indy.gov
Seth Schickel	HNTB	sschickel@hntb.com
Eryn Fletcher	FHWA	Eryn.fletcher@dot.gov
Emily Kibling	Borshoff	Emily.kibling@borshoff.biz
James Turner	IDEM	Jturner2@idem.in.gov
Matt Buffington	IDNR	mbuffington@dnr.in.gov
Runfa Shi	INDOT	rshi@indot.in.gov
Andy Dietrick	INDOT	adietrick@indot.in.gov
David Cleveland	Corradino Group	dcleveland@corradino.com
Brian Boszor	IDNR	bboszor@dnr.in.gov
Virginia Laszewski (via WebEx)	USEPA	Laszewski.virginia@epa.gov
Deb Snyder (via WebEx)	USACE	Deborah.d.snyder@usace.mil
Jim Sullivan (via WebEx)	IDEM Groundwater	jsullivan@idem.in.gov
Ron Bales (via WebEx)	INDOT	rbales@indot.in.gov
Julie Evans (via WebEx)	INDOT	julevans@indot.in.gov
Laura Hilden (via WebEx)	INDOT	lhilden@indot.in.gov
Olivia Speckman (via WebEx)	INDOT	ospeckman@indot.in.gov
Taylor Darrah (via WebEx)	INDOT	tdarrah@indot.in.gov

1. Welcome

Kia Gillette opened the meeting by thanking resource agency representatives in attendance.

2. Introduction of Project Team

Project Team – Several representatives from the Project Team, INDOT and FHWA were present or on the phone (see attached attendee list)

Guests – Five resource agency representatives were present, while three were on the phone (see attached attendee list)

3. Purpose and Need (see attached presentation)

The I-65/I-70 North Split is one of the most heavily-traveled interchanges in the state of Indiana, accommodating about 170,000 vehicles per day and requires a complete reconstruction. Portions of the current interchange were built 50 years ago, and it is nearing the end of its useful life and operating at full capacity.

Many of the existing 32 bridges need rehabilitation or replacement due to structural conditions. Deteriorating pavement conditions require constant repair and patching for roadway and shoulders. The current I-65/I-70 North Split interchange has many complex lane change configurations, which cause possible safety concerns. The reconstructed interchange will minimize the number of lane changes drivers must maneuver to get to their destination.

The project will correct the condition of the bridges and extend the remaining life of the structures at least 25 years. It will improve the condition of the pavement and improve operational issues within the interchange. In addition, it will reduce congestion along I-65 and I-70, while improving safety (if determined to be a need).

4. Project Overview (see attached presentation)

The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) is preparing to reconstruct the I-65/I-70 North Split, as part of our Next Level initiative, a sustainable, data-driven plan to fund bridges and roads in Indiana.

As a result, INDOT’s Project Team for the I-65/I-70 North Split Reconstruction Project recently began work on the Environmental Assessment (EA), as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). We are planning a robust public involvement campaign that will include a wide variety of stakeholders, including employers, local/state officials, civic organizations and neighborhoods. We began our initial Outreach in September.

Over the next year and a half, the Project Team will develop the procurement documents that will allow INDOT to select a contractor in 2019. Construction costs and dates will be determined when we have the bids from potential contractors, and construction may not begin until late 2019 at the earliest.

Question (Q): In a design-build procurement where the design occurs after the contractor is on board and they make changes, how does this impact the original NEPA document? What will the original NEPA document have in it terms of environmental impact? (USEPA)

Answer (A): We will develop to 25 percent design before procurement, which will allow us to establish a footprint both in terms of right of way, the movements that are happening, and how many lanes are needed, etc. Some of these will be non-negotiable for the design-build team, as defined in contract documents. After a design-build team is selected, their final design will not make significant changes, but rather refinements to the preliminary design. We will have certain commitments the design-build teams must follow included in the NEPA document and the contract documents. We base our environmental document on the 25 percent plan and if there happens to be a significant change, it will either be incorporated into the original environmental document or we would re-open the process and look at the environmental impact. *(HNTB)*

Q: How long will the bridge be across the flood plain? *(USEPA)*

A: We will talk about water resources shortly. Natural resource impacts are not anticipated to be a significant concern with this project. We don't anticipate any impacts to floodplains. The anticipated impacts are more to the built environment, such as trails, noise, pedestrian connectivity and aesthetics. *(HNTB)*

5. Environmental Resources (see attached presentation)

The EA will study impacts on homes, businesses and the natural environment. These include cultural resources, Section 4(f) resources, water resources, hazardous materials, noise, air quality, community impacts and Environmental Justice (EJ).

Section 106 Consultation was initiated on September 19, 2017, with an early coordination letter. The Consulting Parties met on October 6, 2017, and provided comments regarding noise, aesthetics, pedestrian connectivity and the Area of Potential Effects (APE). The next Consulting Parties meeting is anticipated to occur in December 2017.

There are two National Historic Landmarks in the APE – the Benjamin Harrison Home and the James Whitcomb Riley House. In addition, there are nine National Register-listed historic districts and 30 National Register-listed individual properties.

The potential Section 4(f) resources for the project include historic resources, the Frank and Judy O'Bannon Soccer Park, Monon Trail, Indianapolis Cultural Trail and Pogues Run Trail.

There are 28 potential wetlands and two potential streams. There will likely be two Waters of the US Reports for the project, and additional coordination with the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) on jurisdiction will be necessary. Coordination with the Indianapolis Department of Public Works (DPW) and Citizens Energy Group on storm water is also underway.

About 250 potential hazardous material concern sites were identified in the Draft Red Flag Investigation within 0.5 mile of the project area. An IDEM Virtual File Cabinet review will be completed as part of the Red Flag Investigation and a meeting will be scheduled with IDEM following the investigation to see if there are other known sites in the area. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment will be completed, and a Phase II soil and ground water sampling will be completed if recommended.

Q: The earlier you can engage us (IDEM) with this the better. Our office of land quality has good quality GIS location data and an understanding on the historical items as well. (IDEM)

A: We are hoping to have the Draft Red Flag Investigation in to INDOT in early December, so we would anticipate engaging the IDEM Office of Land Quality in early 2018. (HNTB)

A Noise Analysis will be completed following INDOT's 2017 Procedure. The carbon monoxide (CO) Maintenance Area along 11th Street (south of I-65) has resulted in the need for an interagency consultation for a possible hot spot analysis. This will likely begin in the coming month or two. In addition, a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis is anticipated based on traffic data >140,000 to 150,000 by the design year.

Community impacts include possible right-of-way acquisition, possible relocations, traffic impacts during construction, noise, aesthetics and connectivity.

A preliminary census data review indicated potential populations of EJ concern within and near the project area. An EJ analysis will be completed for the project and significant public involvement will occur.

6. Archaeology Update (see attached presentation)

Evidence for archaeological deposits will be attained through two phases. Phase 1a will include shovel testing for previously undisturbed areas (if needed) and Phase 1b will include backhoe trenching.

The Phase 1b work was done in September 2017 in the interchange infield. Areas chosen for backhoe trenching were done to not impact existing infrastructure. Sanborn Fire Insurance maps (ca. 1914) were used to guide trench placement.

Ten trenches of various size were excavated. Trenches one through nine showed evidence of disturbance. A brick-lined cistern was identified in trench 10. The bottles recovered from the cistern indicate a portion was filled in the mid-1950s.

7. Preliminary Project Schedule (see attached presentation)

In early 2018, the first public meeting/2nd Resource Agency meeting are anticipated to be held. Mid 2018 preliminary design will be completed and draft project information published for contractor team review. Then, in late 2018, the final project information will be advertised.

Q: Do you plan to put out a draft EA for public review? (USEPA)

A: I'm not sure that was the initial plan, but we could discuss with INDOT and FHWA. We would at least get public comment on the EA that would be included in the FONSI request. (HNTB)

Q: Will you be providing the Resource Agencies with the draft EA for review and comments? (USEPA)

A: We had not planned on this, but can discuss between INDOT and FHWA. (HNTB)

Q: Are you planning a resource agency meeting before the EA? What are the comment options for resource agencies? (FHWA)

A: In early 2018, we will be sharing the Alternative Screening Memo with both the public and resource agencies. This will include recommended alternatives to carry forward, and we will stress that these are slight variations from what we have out there now. In 2019, we will go back to the public and agencies when we have more information on maintenance of traffic (MOT) because this will be a big concern and not available in early 2018. We will come to this group before publication of the EA to give a preview of what we're thinking and there will be further options for input.

In 2019, the 3rd Resource Agency meeting will occur, the EA will be completed, a public hearing will be held, the, final contractor proposals will be submitted and INDOT will select the winning contractor team. Late 2019 is the earliest construction will begin. (HNTB)

8. Next Steps (see attached presentation)

In the coming months, we will develop alternatives and draft the Alternatives Screening Memo, draft the Historic Property Report, hold the next Section 106 Consulting Parties meeting in December, start investigating possible MOT options, and hold a public meeting and Resource Agency meeting in early 2018.

9. Resource Agency Feedback

Comments on today's meeting are due by November 20, 2017.

10. Questions and Answers

Q: Could you state when you are going to engage IDEM formally to start looking at areas of hazardous materials concern? (IDEM)

A: We don't have an exact date, but likely sometime in January or February. (HNTB)

Q: When will you be talking to an EPA air person? (USEPA)

A: My thought would be early December. (HNTB)

Q: Are these streams tied to any nature features, or just roadside ditches? (IDNR)

A: Everything out there looks to be a result of previous construction. We are still working on the drainage design to establish existing drainage patterns and flow output locations. (HNTB)

C: The USACE is aware of the stream situation down there and has a strong suspicion that the streams are not jurisdictional, but I can't commit to that. My plan is to strongly encourage you to get an approved jurisdictional determination (JD). I think there is a strong possibility that this will not need a 404 permit. (USACE)

Q: Have you done dye trace studies to see where the water is going? (USEPA)

- A: We can figure it out based on information from the city and utilities, we just haven't had a chance to examine it yet. We have remarkable data from Citizens Energy Group already that we're still investigating. *(HNTB)*
- C: I suggest you keep IDEM in the loop. As you go a little east, the retention basin on the south side of I-70 has a specific role in Pogues Run and that complex system minimizes flooding. I'm not sure if it's connected to this project. *(IDEM)*
- Q: Are you talking about the big open pond to the east? *(HNTB)*
- A: Yes. This is key with the flooding issues they have at Pogues Run. It has an artistic boat in it. Don't know if that has any impact, just FYI. *(IDEM)*
- Q: Did I hear earlier that Pogues Run is piped under the southern part of the interchange? *(USEPA)*
- A: Yes, but it's a little bit further south in the project area than the interchange proper. *(HNTB)*
- Q: Did I hear you right that there is flooding in downtown in this area? *(USEPA)*
- A: Yes, in the past there have been flooding issues with Pogues Run, but the structure Kia zoomed in on (in Google Earth) has mitigated that (a few miles to the east they built a larger retaining structure). It flows as an open channel toward downtown and it was put into that pipe structure "before a lot of us were born." Pogues Run is under the road and goes into a pipe. It is piped through all of downtown Indianapolis. *(INDOT)*
- Q: Is it an impaired stream based on IDEM criteria? *(USEPA)*
- A: We can look that up. Jim's folks would have a handle on that. *(HNTB)*
- Q: Where does the water show up? *(USACE)*
- A: In the White River. *(HNTB)*
- Q: Is there a second stream or run in this area? *(USACE)*
- A: The best thing we're calling a stream is the concrete-lined basin I zoomed in on within the interchange. Two unnamed tributaries were identified at that location. *(HNTB)*
- Q: Pogues Run goes under the project, but there is no plan to touch this? *(USEPA)*
- A: Yes. We are impacting the bridges over Ohio Street but this won't have an impact on the existing Pogues Run pipes. *(HNTB)*

Meeting Minutes – Resource Agency Meeting #1 – November 3, 2017

- C: Someone painted Pogues Run with a blue line which is a good representation of where it runs. It also goes under the football stadium and there are markers on the street where it turns. *(DPW)*
- Q: Are we still looking at March for the maintenance of traffic (MOT) information? *(DPW)*
- A: We are shooting to have a draft document in early 2018 and then MOT will come after that. Traffic modeling for MOT will be later in the spring. We are building a base traffic model now and building the alternative traffic models, but that will take a few more months. *(HNTB)*
- C: DPW, the City and INDOT have already had conversations about pedestrian and bike connectivity, specifically where Vermont Street goes under I-65/I-70. There is an agreement that will eliminate the bridge at Vermont Street and install a pedestrian-only access structure under the highway. *(DPW)*
- Q: What is the purpose of that? *(USACE)*
- A: There isn't a lot of car traffic there, so INDOT approached the City about eliminating the bridge at that location. Eliminating a bridge saves money. The City requested that pedestrian/bicycle connectivity be maintained there and INDOT agreed to install a smaller structure. *(HNTB)*
- Q: So if you eliminate it, would the City be ok? *(USACE)*
- A: Yes, as long as pedestrian and bicycle connectivity is maintained. *(HNTB)*
- Q: Are you planning to add additional travel lanes on the interstate there? *(USEPA)*
- A: We are currently investigating traffic volumes there, so it is possible lanes will be added. This is about where the ramp system will start. Because we will be reconfiguring the ramps in the area, it will look differently. *(HNTB)*
- C: There is a place where the Monon Trail goes under the interstate (in northern Indianapolis) and it's like a tunnel for a couple hundred feet. It's not intimidating. I think engineering a tunnel in this case that's not 'scary' is doable. *(USACE)*
- Q: Is the crime rate comparable? *(USEPA)*
- A: No, but personally I wouldn't be worried about it. *(USACE)*
- Q: Where are the EJ areas for the project? *(USEPA)*
- A: We are still defining that, looking at census data and putting together maps. We will have more information by our next meeting. *(HNTB)*
- Q: When do you think you will have your first neighborhood meetings? *(USEPA)*

- A: We are planning our first public meeting for early 2018, but we are happy to talk with people now if they want to. We are hoping that by waiting until early 2018, we will have additional information to present to them than what's out there now. *(HNTB)*
- Q: Have you been looking at what people have been writing on internet sites? To see people's opinions? I think they have an expectation or will ask why you wouldn't consider more radical measures for the project. The earlier you engage these groups the better. In other cities major highways have been taken out of the neighborhood (Boston Big Dig, for example) so I think people in the area will be upset. *(USACE)*
- C: DPW has already been contacted by three groups from the neighborhood who want the road gone. Andy has talked to them. Some have just recovered from the highway going in 50 years ago. You will have a strong neighborhood focus and they will be coming at you. Andy knows who they are. So, the earlier you can start the neighborhood conversation the better. I've *(Parker)* already met with three of them. *(DPW)*
- C: Even if it's just Andy meeting with them now, they have extensive questions and they want to shape the project. They don't want to hear that this is the project and they have no say. *(DPW)*
- C: People will already be upset that INDOT is not going to consider a Big Dig, but I think you need to address why it's not feasible in this situation because they've done it in other big cities. So, to say it can't be done is probably not an answer they will be okay with. *(USACE)*
- C: You identified that the project has been funded. If you identify the dollar amount funded for this project, then perhaps this might be a reason why something more expensive can't be done. *(USEPA)*
- Q: Does the Dig Indy tunnel have an impact on this? *(USACE)*
- A: Anything underneath ground has issues with the depth of groundwater. *(HNTB)*
- Q: Do you have preliminary plans on how it's going to look? *(IDNR)*
- A: INDOT is going to consider aesthetics, but we don't have anything visual at this point. We are getting into alternatives, but are not there yet. *(HNTB)*
- Q: With the loss of pollinator habitat, are you considering any native plantings? IDNR has a program that may be able to provide some assistance. This information will be included in our early coordination letter. *(IDNR)*
- A: That is a possibility. If there is excess buffer area it may be possible to do some native plantings. *(HNTB)*

Meeting Minutes – Resource Agency Meeting #1 – November 3, 2017

C: I'd like to clarify the earlier Vermont Street conversation. Vermont Street is here in the middle (points at screen). There are eight other crossings under the interstate and each has pedestrian traffic including Vermont. It's just this one where access would change, where the others would stay the same. New York may be the one that doesn't have any. But there is a bicycle network under construction at New York and Michigan. They are currently one-way in opposite directions and they are building bike lanes. (HNTB)

Q: Bicycle trails were mentioned earlier. Those wouldn't actually come down and use this potential tunnel? (USEPA)

A: They could. Those are connected enough that there are north and south streets between them, but there is no trail connection between them. (HNTB)

The Vermont neighborhood actually requested the bigger opening without traffic. If access is removed, however, they wanted the opening to be big enough for trucks to come through (for maintenance work) and emergency vehicles. (INDOT)

Q: The Monon Trail does not come down to Vermont? And the Cultural Trail does not either? (USEPA)

A: Yes, that's correct. We could arrange a field tour for the next meeting if that would be deemed helpful. (HNTB)

Q: Are there any public and/or private daycare/childcare places/facilities in the area? Using the project area maps, USEPA requested the presenters identify where the industrial, commercial and residential areas (including potential EJ communities) are located during this WebEx/meeting/call. (USEPA)

A: The northwest side is the Old Northside Historic District which is largely a neighborhood. There is a larger commercial area further west. There is a soccer park north of the interchange. To the south there is some commercial and residential along the St. Joseph area and Mass Ave. The north is more industrial but it's a redevelopment area. The area I'm circling is an IPS maintenance facility but it may not be that for long as it's currently up for sale. Toward the east along the north side there are some churches and then it becomes more residential. To the south and east the area includes a lot of industrial buildings but it's also a redevelopment area with breweries, etc. There is a private school and the railroad. Along the south is more commercial and developed and there is not as much residential use immediately abutting the interstate at this point. (HNTB)

Q: Just to clarify, where do you think the EJ areas are? (USEPA)

A: Possibly to the east and to the north of I-70. (HNTB)

Q: Do you think you may have to acquire some businesses or homes? (USEPA)

A: Possibly, but we don't know at this point. We hope to have a better idea when we have the alternative screening discussion early next year. *(HNTB)*

Q: In terms of construction, design, developing best management practices, will you take into account extreme weather events related to the storm water? I would think the EA would address the issue, but just confirming. *(USEPA)*

A: We will meet with Citizens Energy Group and DPW on the requirements for this project. INDOT has requirements for storm water quality control and prevention plans, so that's something that's standard on INDOT projects. Best management practices would be addressed in each plan, which is a commitment in the contract. We will adhere with current policy on this project. *(INDOT)*

11. Adjourn