



MEETING SUMMARY

Date: October 9, 2018
Time: 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
Meeting: Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #3
Location: Indiana Government Center, Conference Room B, Indianapolis, IN

**Complete attendee list begins on page 6*

Meeting officially began at 2:15 p.m.

1. Introductions

Kia Gillette from HNTB thanked the Community Advisory Committee for their participation. She said the scope of the project changed due to feedback from the community and there is a stronger focus on safety. She stated the preliminary preferred alternative to be discussed in more detail during the meeting does not have added through lanes, is in the existing right-of-way, and has minimal walls.

2. Alternatives Screening Report

John Myers from HNTB began by defining the problems within the North Split interchange. Key points included:

Problems

- The North Split interchange was constructed in the 1960s and 1970s, and the pavement is past its life expectancy.
- The interchange is constantly in need of maintenance and repairs due to its condition.
- Bridge conditions are getting worse. There are 11 bridges with a life-span of less than 5 years and 16 bridges with a life-span of 5-10 years.
- The North Split project area has higher crash rates than other Indiana urban interstates. Fatalities are almost two times higher, injuries are almost three times higher, and property damage crashes are more than two times higher.
- The highest number of crashes occur on the west leg of the interchange in weaving areas. The top four crash locations in the North Split project area are:
 - #1 Pennsylvania Ramp Weave Section
 - #2 Delaware Ramp Weave Section
 - #3 I-65/I-70 Merge/Lane Drop
 - #4 I-70 Curve Merge
- Nine types of bottlenecks are defined by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and four of these exist in the North Split project area.

Seth Schickel from HNTB discussed the environmental resources near the project area, and described key comments made in public and agency input.

Purpose and Need, Environmental Resources, and Public Input

- The purpose and need of the North Split project is to correct deteriorated bridge and pavement conditions, improve safety, and reduce congestion.
- The North Split project area is surrounded by environmental resources, such as historic districts, a park, the Monon Greenway, the Cultural Trail, and the CSX Railroad.
- INDOT and the project team have spent numerous hours meeting and talking with the public at public meetings, community and neighborhood group meetings, advisory committee meetings, and through social media, email, and phone calls.
- INDOT has listened to public input and significantly changed the scope of the North Split Project – the preliminary preferred alternative does not include added through lanes or large retaining walls.

Seth Schickel described each alternative in the Alternatives Screening Report, then discussed next steps in the Environmental Assessment process.

Alternatives

- Three alternatives considered low/cost and minimal and the alternative with the greatest impact have been eliminated:
 - #1 No-build
 - #2 Transportation System Management
 - #3 Bridge and Pavement Replacement in Kind
 - #5 Full Interchange Reconstruction
- One alternative (Alternative 4) was retained for further study, with three options relative to ramps on the west leg of the interchange.
 - Option 4a Pennsylvania and Delaware Ramps Closed
 - Option 4b Pennsylvania and Delaware Ramps Open
 - Option 4c Selected Ramp Access Restrictions
- Alternative 4c was identified as the preliminary preferred alternative. It would meet the project purpose and need by improving safety and removing the worst bottlenecks. It would be more compact and would not add through lanes, and it would be constructed within the existing right-of-way with minimal exterior walls.

Next Steps

Next steps will be to gather feedback on the preliminary preferred alternative and the Alternative Screening Report through October 29. The project team will continue to refine the preliminary preferred alternative which will include analyzing effects to historic properties and determining mitigation measures for effects to historic properties. The project team anticipates publishing the Environmental Assessment in early 2020.

3. Breakout Sessions

CAC members were divided into seven groups comprised of individuals representing organizations with similar interests (e.g. government, neighborhood, tourism). Each group discussed the following questions:

- Do you have follow-up questions about the Alternatives Screening Report or the preliminary preferred alternative?
- How do you think the preliminary preferred alternative would impact your organization and key stakeholders (positively or negatively, and can that impact be quantified)?
- As the North Split Project Team moves forward evaluating the preliminary preferred alternative, what are the main priorities you would like them to consider?
 - **Community** (i.e. How can safety be improved? How can connectivity be enhanced? What type of landscaping would you like to see? What do you envision for side streets and sidewalks around the project area?)
 - **Design** (i.e. What are some important factors to consider in design? What type of aesthetics are important?)
 - **Construction** (i.e. Is it better to have more restrictions with a shorter construction time? Or fewer restrictions with a longer construction time?)

Each group reported back to the larger group and shared key takeaways and questions from their discussions.

Group #1 (Government/Municipalities - Indianapolis)

Q: How tall will the walls be on the north and south sides of I-65 for Alternative 4c?

A: It is estimated the walls will be a maximum of 11 feet tall on the north and 7 feet in the south. Alternatives like changing the slopes will be reviewed to reduce or possibly eliminate walls.

Group #2 (Government/Municipalities – Surrounding Cities)

Q: What happens to the trails?

A: The Monon Greenway will remain where it is. Pogue’s Run and the Cultural Trail will remain where they are at the south end of the Monon at 10th Street.

Q: How will you keep the trails open during construction?

A: That will be addressed during the final stages of design. There will be times when a detour must be posted.

Q: Will there be murals or artwork?

A: Keep Indianapolis Beautiful helps facilitate murals downtown. Coordination will continue with them as the project progresses.

One group suggested sustainable artwork instead of paint that may peel or fade.

Q: What happens to excess property?

A: That is unknown at this time. INDOT and the City will work through what happens to excess property when the time comes.

Group #3 (Neighborhoods)

Q: What happens to West Street with the ramp closures?

A: Preliminary traffic estimates show an increase in traffic at West Street. Additional traffic studies will be conducted to define these potential impacts in greater detail.

Q: Can we keep the mature trees during and after construction?

A: It is uncertain now, but the project team will look for ways to preserve trees.

Group #4 (Neighborhoods)

No comments or questions.

Group #5 (Special Interest Groups)

Group 5 shared their thoughts related to the breakout session worksheet:

- Regarding how the project will impact our community, this is a reasonable balance, but we're losing some access. When it comes to impacts, even 4c is wider than existing.
- Regarding aesthetic treatments, will there be plants and green walls? If there are some treatments or design elements that could mitigate impact that's what we want.
- If we're moving trees, let's be sure we're moving them to the right spot.
- For construction we hope for a balance. Could we close the north and south leg for a period of time? Then, close east and west? Can we minimize a full closure? If it were a hyperfix, there would be potential to increase transit and partner with IndyGo to increase transit use.
- We are concerned about what vertical bridges would look like. If there are three layers, won't it be a visual impact?

Q: How high will the bridges be with the flyovers?

A: That will be determined during design. The interstate leg elevations will remain the about same as they are today.

Group #6 & #7 (Utilities/Facilities/Schools/Events/Tourism)

Q: What will the design speed and lifespan of new construction be?

A: The design speed will vary at locations within the interchange. The maximum would be 55 mph. The design year is 2041.

Q: Will there be local intersection improvements?

A: The need for local intersection improvements has not yet been defined. Permanent and temporary impacts on local streets will be evaluated in the Environmental Assessment.

Q: What about prohibiting commercial traffic?

A: Any truck prohibitions would be policy issues that would go beyond the analysis conducted so far. The legislature would have to take this up. Truck diversion during construction will be evaluated in the Environmental Assessment.

Q: Would INDOT consider a development in the northwest corner of the project area?

A: That is another policy question. The City and State will have to coordinate regarding any public use of INDOT property in the future.

Group #8 (Businesses/Business-Serving Organizations)

Group 8 had no specific questions, but shared the following recommendations:

- It would be helpful to spell out exactly where the public CAN go as opposed to where they cannot go in the presentation.
- It would be helpful to give the public an idea of time difference for construction (e.g. with closures). Is it a matter of years or months?

4. General Questions (Q) & Answers (A):

Q: Can you discuss the timeline for the Environmental Assessment process further?

A: The current plan is to publish the Environmental Assessment in early 2020. It will be followed by an official public comment period and hearing.

Q: Will there be restrictions on trucks during construction or once it's opened?

A: Maintenance of traffic plans during construction could include limitations on size and weight. Removing trucks permanently would be done through the legislature.

Q: Do the LOS estimates for 2041 include potential impacts of mass transit?

A: Yes. The team uses the traffic model created by the Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). It incorporates transit plans, including the three planned Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) lines. These BRT lines divert more traffic from local streets than interstates because of where they are located.

5. Conclude

The meeting concluded at 4:15 p.m., with reminders of the October 29 public comment period and the public open house on October 10 from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. at Arsenal Tech High School.

Attendees:

CAC Members	
Kenneth Avidor	Chatham-Arch Neighborhood
Hilary Barnes	Old Northside Neighborhood
Andy Beck	Cottage Home Neighborhood
Tom Beck	Downtown Indy
Glenn Blackwood	Fletcher Place Neighborhood
Jennifer Boehm	IUPUI
Paula Brooks	Ransom Place Neighborhood
Garry Chilluffo	Historic Urban Neighborhoods of Indianapolis
Bryan Corbin	Eiteljorg Museum
Marsh Davis	Indiana Landmarks
Kelly Dodds	NCAA
Mark Fisher	Indy Chamber
Tedd Grain	Local Initiatives Support Corporation
David Greene	Indianapolis' Concerned Clergy
Anna Gremling	Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization
Burns Gutzwiller	Windsor Park Neighborhood
Pete Haupers	St. Joseph Neighborhood
Charlie Henry	Victory Field
Jen Higginbotham	Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization
Olubunmi Ijose	Mayor's Neighborhood Advocate (Area #8)
Mikka Jackson	Indiana State Personnel Department
Jose Jarzen	Keep Indianapolis Beautiful
Marjorie Kienle	Lockerbie Square Neighborhood
Paul Knapp	Interstate Business Group
Gary Langston	Indiana Motor Truck Association
Lawrence McCormack	Cummins

Kevin Osburn	ASLA
Nick Parr	Boone County Planning Commission
Meg Purnsley	Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission
Christine Ritzmann	Brown County Area Planning Commission
Philip Roth	Central Indiana Regional Transportation Authority
Jordan Ryan	North Square Neighborhood
Britni Saunders	Indiana State Personnel Department
Lindsey Sipes	Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee
Sarah Stegmeyer	Indiana Restaurant and Lodging Association
Meg Storrow	Mass Ave Merchants Association
Amy Waggoner	Salesforce
Project Team	
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Akbar Bakhshi	Corradino
David Cleveland	Corradino
Jennifer Dzwonar	Borshoff
Kia Gillette	HNTB
Johnny Han	Corradino
Ali Hernandez	Borshoff
Laura Hilden	INDOT
Evan Land	Corradino
Burleigh Law	HNTB
Dan McCoy	INDOT
Cristina Melendez	Borshoff
Laura Morales	HNTB
John Myers	HNTB
Erin Pipkin	Compass Outreach Solutions
Dave Pluckebaum	Corradino

Chris Poland	United Consulting
Jeromy Richardson	United Consulting
Katie Rounds	INDOT
Seth Schickel	HNTB
Runfa Shi	INDOT
Maria Wainscott	TSW
Sam Wisser	TSW