



Date: October 18, 2018
Time: 2:30 – 4:00 p.m.
Meeting: Environmental Justice Working Group Meeting #2
Location: Indianapolis Urban League

**Complete attendee list begins on page 6.*

1. Welcome and Introductions

Kia Gillette from HNTB thanked the Environmental Justice (EJ) Working Group 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. EJ Review

Erin Pipkin from the North Split public involvement team gave an overview of the EJ Working Group.

3. Current Public Involvement Activities

Erin Pipkin talked through the current public involvement activities taking place, including the Alternative Screening Report, public comment period, meetings to date and upcoming Environmental Assessment. Updates from the first meeting include:

- Adding two new members (10 were invited)
- Building the database of Working Group members, locations to promote the project and additional resources that serve EJ populations

4. Targeted EJ Outreach

Erin Pipkin discussed the team's environmental justice outreach efforts to promote the Alternatives Screening Report and open house:

- A Spanish-language version of the open house flier was created and an interpreter was available at the open house
- A copy of the Screening Report was placed at Central Library
- We emailed open house fliers to the EJ database (100+ individuals or organizations)
- Delivered fliers to 50 locations such as grocery stores, libraries and churches

Questions (Q) and Answers (A):

Q: Have fliers been sent out and social media been utilized for outreach?

A: Fliers for the public open house were placed or handed out at approximately 50 locations (many of which were suggested at our first meeting). Fliers were in both English and Spanish. There are North Split Facebook and Twitter accounts. There hasn't been a lot of activity on social media, but as soon as we published the Alternatives Screening Report we received comments. A few social posts have been boosted and we've promoted on Next Door.

Q: Will there be outreach elements with a video?

A: Our open house presentation was recorded and is available on Channel 16 throughout the comment period and linked via our social media accounts. [Erin shared the open house presentation and the video link with the EJ Working Group on October 19.]

5. Alternatives Screening Report Presentation

Kia Gillette from HTNB discussed the problems with the North Split interchange and the process for identifying environmental resources and gathering input. High-level points included:

Problems

- The North Split interchange was constructed in the 1960s and 1970s, 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 and there are 11 bridges with a service life of less than five years and 16 bridges with a service life of 5-10 years.
- The North Split interchange has crash rates higher 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 in the North Split interchange.
- There are four top crash locations within the North Split interchange:
 - #1 Pennsylvania Ramp Weave Section
 - #2 Delaware Ramp Weave Section
 - #3 I-65/I-70 Merge/Lane Drop
 - #4 I-70 Curve/Merge
- Highest number of crashes occur on the west leg of the interchange in weaving areas at the Pennsylvania Street exit and Delaware Street entrance ramps.

Purpose and Need/Resources/Public Involvement

- The purpose and need of the North Split project is to correct deteriorated bridge and pavement conditions, improve safety, and improve interchange operations to 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 committees, 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.

Alternatives

Seth Schickel with HNTB walked through the alternatives from the Alternative Screening Report. High level points included:

- Three alternatives considered low/cost or minimal and have been eliminated because they did not meet the purpose and need:
 - #1 No-build
 - #2 Transportation System Management
 - #3 Bridge and Pavement Replacement in Kind
- One alternative was eliminated due to impacts:
 - #5 Full Interchange Reconstruction
- Alternative 4 includes three options that address the purpose and need with trade-offs between access and level of impacts.
 - 4a - Pennsylvania and Delaware ramps closed
 - 4b - Pennsylvania and Delaware ramps open with all current access
 - 4c - Selected ramp access restrictions

Alternative 4c improves safety, removes the worst bottlenecks, does not add through lanes, is more compact, is within the existing right-of-way, has minimal walls, and meets the project purpose and need. It has been identified by INDOT as the preliminary preferred alternative, subject to public and agency feedback.

6. Questions (Q) and Answers (A)

Q: Who engaged HNTB to do this project?

A: INDOT.

Q: Currently, when I-65 and I-70 come together you also have access to Ohio and Fletcher, will that still be the case?

A: You will still be able to access the Ohio through Fletcher exits (called Collector-Distributor exits) from I-70 westbound and from the Delaware on-ramp to I-65. Only I-65 southbound traffic cannot access Ohio/Fletcher.

Q: Will there be anything to address traffic entering the highway at Keystone making those crosses?

A: Traffic entering I-70 at Keystone (or before) will still have access to I-65, I-70 and the Collector-Distributor exits. The exit layout will be slightly different, but there are still several options.

If you get on at Delaware, you cannot immediately get on I-65 from that entrance. You can take the Collector-Distributor ramp and merge onto I-65 south.

Q: If you're coming from I-65 north traveling south, where are people getting off if there is no Ohio/Michigan access? Does your study include impacts on West Street and Meridian Street?

A: It's likely people will get off on West or Meridian Streets. We used the MPO traffic model in these initial studies. However, additional studies will take place during the Environmental Assessment process.

Q: How does this set us up for the future? What is the life-span of this alternative?

A: The current infrastructure was not built to last as long as what we use now. Today we have much better technology. INDOT looks at 20 years into the future to anticipate traffic.

Q: How do these alternatives impact the entire interstate system?

A: All alternatives are flexible for future solutions. The System-Level Analysis looked at the entire downtown interstate system to see what kind of things could happen in the future and figure out how we can build the North Split. We must address the problems in the North Split interchange now. The system-level solution is a much larger project in terms of footprint. We're starting with the North Split due to the safety issues. The interchange must be above grade.

Bridges have a different timeline. A new bridge can last over 50 years but will require regular maintenance over its life to get to this age.

Q: Was there consideration of eliminating I-65 entirely?

A: The System-Level Analysis looked at examples in other cities that have decommissioned a highway. None of these examples had the same amount of traffic volumes. It was challenging to use other examples because their traffic volumes are not as large as ours. The System-Level Analysis is available on the project website.

Q: When you're doing your analysis, I'm afraid you're not taking into consideration plans for IU Health, IUPUI and 16 Tech. They're planning to put thousands of cars on 10th Street and MLK.

It's important to make sure that growth is incorporated. We need to pay attention to the impacts on 10th Street and Indiana Ave.

A: Our traffic modeling is based on the Indy MPO model. The MPO model includes population and employment estimates to generate traffic volumes.

Q: The GM plant will probably access via Harding. On the north side, they will use White River and MLK. Will there be impacts to city streets?

A: There may be some impacts to city streets.

Q: That impact on us is not getting the same consideration. Part of this is because we have these projects that have not been considered yet.

A: Thank you for bringing these projects to our attention. We met with IU Health and 16 Tech and will investigate further.

Q: There is no systematic review for new developments. The old Coca-Cola plant will have 1,100 parking spaces. There is a lack of systematic review at the city level. The Purple Line will be at Meridian. I don't know if these traffic studies have been compared.

A: Our studies do incorporate proposed bus line developments, but do not include other specific planned developments.

Q: What are the opportunities for mitigation?

A: We will look at mitigation in our next phase. Now that we have a preferred alternative, we will look at how we can avoid significant impacts and continue to engage the public.

Q: With regard to eliminating bottlenecks, how do we know changes in traffic will be worked into assumptions, so we don't create more bottlenecks?

A: This will be outlined in the Interstate Access Document. This FHWA-approved document is created to ensure interstate conditions don't get worse. We did enough traffic analysis to estimate how 4c will perform from a traffic perspective.

We will analyze local roads and adjacent interchanges for vehicle traffic as well. This doesn't include walking or biking traffic.

Q: Will you look at trees during the Environmental Assessment? Can Keep Indianapolis Beautiful (KIB) re-plant? There is also a concern that new trees won't match trees that are 20 years old.

A: Yes, we are considering the impacts to existing landscape. We've had several conversations with KIB and they will be involved throughout the project. There are also opportunities for public art installations.

We will definitely look at ways to replace trees.

Q: Can you share a little bit about the ARUP study that may impact planning?

A: We are aware of the study and will review it when it is published. The Rethink Coalition started out in opposition to the project. We've taken some of their key principles into consideration. From our understanding, the ARUP study by Rethink will analyze economic impacts based on changing land use.

Our plan has been to incorporate findings that could benefit this project. The Indy Chamber has been very involved.

7. Conclude

The meeting concluded at 4:00 p.m.

Attendees:

Project Team	
Dave Cleveland	Corradino
Kia Gillette	HNTB
Ali Hernandez	Borshoff
Brandon Miller	INDOT
Laura Morales	HNTB
Erin Pipkin	Compass Outreach Solutions
Seth Schickel	HNTB
Sam Wiser	TSW
Environmental Justice Working Group Members	
Orion Bell	CICOA Aging and In-Home Solutions
Paula Brooks	Random Place Neighborhood
Moira Carlstedt	Indianapolis Neighborhood Housing Partnership
David Greene	Indianapolis' Concerned Clergy/Purpose of Life Ministries
Ashley Haynes	Keep Indianapolis Beautiful
Bryan Luellen	IndyGo
Mandla Moyo	AARP Indiana
Alison Redenz	Health by Design
Philip Roth	Central Indiana Regional Transportation Authority
Carlton Waterhouse	IUPUI
Mo McReynolds	Mayors Neighborhood Advocate

Others who were invited, but could not attend:

Environmental Justice Working Group Members	
Zach Adamson	City-County Council
Melissa Benton	John H. Boner Community Center
David Bethuram	Catholic Charities- Indianapolis Office

Ildefonso Carbajal	La Ola Latino Americano
Lori Casson	Dayspring Center
Satchuel Cole	Near Eastside Community Organization
Marlene Dotson	The Indiana Latino Institute
Carl Ellison	Indiana Minority Health Coalition
Margaret Frericks	Improving Kids' Environment (IKE)
Greg Garrett	Mayor's Neighborhood Advocate (Area #7)
Burns Gutzwiller	Windsor Park Neighborhood Association
Kathy Hahn Keiner	Gleaners Food Bank of Indiana
Liliana Hamnik	La Voz de Indiana
Andrew Hart	The Oaks Academy
Cynthia Hooks	Kennedy-King Neighborhood
Olubunmi Ijose	Mayor's Neighborhood Advocate (Area #8)
Kristen LaEace	Indiana Association of Area Agencies on Aging
Jon Laramore	Immigrants and Language Rights Center (Indiana Legal Services Inc.)
Ike McCoy	Mayor's Neighborhood Advocate (Area 10)
Felix Medina	Vedia Global
Christian Mosburg	Willard Park of Holy Cross- Westminster Civic Alliance
Cal Nelson	Wheeler Mission
Vop Osili	City-County Council
Chrissy Petersen	Westminster Neighborhood Services
Todd Poindexter	Salvation Army Rent and Utility Assistance
Reverend Tom Polak	Metropolitan Baptist Center
Christopher Purnell	Neighborhood Christian Legal Clinic
Jacob Sipe	Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority)
Kristian Stricklen	Indianapolis Public Schools (IPS)
Kiko Suarez	United Way of Central Indiana

Cynthia Taylor	Community Action of Greater Indianapolis
Jennifer Vigran	Second Helpings
Alice Watson	Black Expo
Teresa Wessel	Horizon House
Terrence White	Community Action of Greater Indianapolis
Kevin Whited	IndyCog