



**Consulting Party Meeting
Meeting Summary
September 19, 2022 from 4:00 to 5:15 PM EDT
Southeast Community Services
901 Shelby Street, Indianapolis
Des. No. 1400073
I-65 Safety & Efficiency
Indianapolis, Marion County, Indiana**

INDOT Attendees

Andy Dietrick, Major Projects communications
Clint Kelly, Environmental Services-Cultural Resources Office (ES-CRO)
Brian Shattuck, Project Manager

FHWA Attendee

Kari Carmany-George

Parsons Attendees

Berry Craig, public involvement
John LaBlonde, deputy project manager
Mindy Peterson, public involvement
Eric Jagger, environmental

ASC Group Attendees

Douglas Terpstra
Sarah Terheide

In Person Attendees:

Bruce Colville, Fletcher Place
Jed Fuller, Old Southside
Carolyn Leffler, Southeast Community Services
Vickie Goens, Garfield Park
Paul Mykytka Fountain Square Neighborhood Association
Nick Zimmerman, Bates-Hendricks Neighborhood Association
Beverle A Kane
Charlie Richardson, Rethink Coalition, co-chair
Brenda Freije, Rethink Coalition, CEO
Thomas Kube
Carrie Birge
Isaiah Fasoldt
Angie Calvert
Hallie Robbins, Concord Center
Jess Darling, Fountain Square Alliance
Kurt Bokerman
Dawn Olsen, Fletcher Place Neighborhood Association

Kelli Mirgeaux, Southeast Neighborhood Development (SEND)
Peggy Frame, Southeast Community Services
Allissa Impink, Fletcher Place Neighborhood Assoc.
Zach Schalk

Virtual Attendees:

Marjorie Kienle, Historic Urban Neighborhoods of Indianapolis
Meg Storrow, Rethink Coalition
Sarah Roberts
Jeri Warner, University Heights Neighborhood
Jeff Christoffersen, Lockerbie Square
Brad Beaubien, Tourism Tomorrow
Paujla (no additional name given)
Caitlin M Lehman, Historic Structures Reviewer (Indiana DNR)
Scotty Z. Wilson, Holy Cross Neighborhood
Laura Giffel, Fountain Fletcher District
Russell C. Menyhart

1) Introductions (Parsons)

Mindy Peterson (MP), Parsons public involvement, opened with a brief introduction of how to interact through the virtual meeting.

- The Historic Property Report (HPR) can be found on the project website.
- Douglas Terpstra of ASC Group, Inc., and John LaBlonde of Parsons were introduced.
- The purpose of the Consulting Parties meeting is to get input from the consulting parties on historic resources and the HPR. There is an October 4 deadline for comments.
- A public information meeting will be coming up in the fall.

2) Brief Overview of I-65 Safety & Efficiency Project (Parsons)

- MP presented several maps that are available on the project website, including one showing the project location and one showing the locations of expected improvements.
- We are very early in the process, conducting environmental analysis and preliminary design, with plenty of time for stakeholders to provide input
- Most of the work will be within existing right-of-way, and there will be no changes to ramps or access.
- No long-term closures are expected. I-65 will remain open to at least two lanes of traffic each direction during peak travel times during construction.

3) National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (Parsons)

- MP gave a brief explanation of NEPA and its role in the project.

4) I-65 Safety & Efficiency Project planned improvements

- Taking highway from three lanes to four lanes in each direction, majority of which will be widened to the inside utilizing the existing shoulder
- The southern one-third of the project will be where the widening will be to the outside.
- The bridges over Naomi Street and Pleasant Run Parkway (northbound only) will be rehabilitated and widened, as will the northbound I-65 over Morris Street and Prospect Street bridges.
- The Hanna Avenue bridge will be replaced and will accommodate a future pedestrian pathway.
- Pavement patching and resurfacing to occur through the entire project limits.
- The project will examine the current and anticipated noise levels. INDOT's noise policy is posted on the project website. Noise abatement measures will be examined.

5) Brief Overview of the Section 106 Consultation Process (ASC Group)

Douglas Terpstra (DT) reviewed the Section 106 Consultation Process.

- Section 106 is part of the National Historic Preservation Act, which is a separate law from NEPA, but often incorporated into the NEPA process
- In an urban area like Indianapolis, cultural resources are often the most prominent element of the environment that could see impacts
- Federal agencies are required to take into account the impacts of the undertakings on historic properties.
- Public feedback is part of that process, including from consulting parties.
- Step 1 is initiate consultation.
- Step 2 is to identify historic resources. The HPR is part of the process, but not an end point. Feedback regarding historic resources can be provided at any time and will be considered.
- Future steps will be to evaluate effects to historic resources and to resolve any adverse effects. These steps will be coming up in the fall and into next spring.
- Identify an Area of Potential Effects (APE), the geographic area within which an undertaking could directly or indirectly affect a historic property. The APE is not the same as the construction limits.
- National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and standards under which a property could be found to be historic

6) Overview of the HPR (ASC Group)

DT presented the information included in the HPR:

- Early coordination letter was sent out in April
- HPR was released in early September
- An archaeological investigation determined that the project is not likely to affect archaeological resources, as the project area is within an existing interstate highway corridor that is already disturbed. No further archaeology is planned.
- The HPR is part of the process, not an end point, and input regarding historic properties can still be provided and will be considered under Section 106.
- The APE generally went 500 feet on either side of the center line of the interstate. The APE was made a little further in some areas with clear lines of sight from within the neighborhoods toward the project

area. The APE includes indirect effects, such as visual changes, including potentially noise walls which would be a new visual element in historic neighborhoods.

- HPR methodology, including check of existing information on file with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), field survey, and evaluation against the NRHP standards.
- Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory standards: Outstanding, Notable, Contributing, Non-Contributing
- Field survey examined Notable and Outstanding rated properties and properties not previously identified that could be rated Contributing.
- Existing NRHP-listed historic districts and properties
 - Fletcher Place Historic District
 - Holy Rosary-Danish Church Historic District
 - Fountain Square Historic District
 - Indianapolis Park and Boulevard System Historic District
 - Horace Mann Public School No. 13
 - Wheeler-Schebler Carburetor Company/Wheeler Arts Community
- Newly identified properties recommended as eligible for the NRHP
 - St. Patrick Catholic Church Historic District
 - Green Lea Farm/Hotel Tango Farms
 - Sanders-Childers House
 - 941 E. English Avenue
 - 937 E. English Avenue
- Comments are due by October 4 on the HPR, the APE, unidentified historic properties, potential additional consulting parties, locations or setup for future consulting party meetings. DT's contact information was shared in the presentation and on a project handout.
- Another consulting party meeting will be scheduled to discuss effects to historic properties.

7) Discussion of future steps (Parsons)

- MP discussed where we are in the environmental process.
- A public hearing will be held next fall with the draft NEPA document
- Forming advisory groups now, including Community Advisory Committee (CAC) and Environmental Justice Committee; invited attendees to let the Project Team know if they're interested in joining the CAC or EJ committee.
- Public meeting this fall in open house format
- Construction is expected to begin in spring 2025 and last up to two years.
- Project information and information from the consulting party meeting will be available on the project website.
- Comments not related to historic resources can be provided through INDOT4U, and comment channels were shared in the presentation and on a project handout.
- All meeting materials will be posted on the website, I65SafetyandEfficiency.com. The website is also a great resource for additional project information. Interested parties should sign up for email or text updates on the project.

8) Questions/Discussion (Consulting Parties)

The floor was opened for questions and discussion virtually and in person, outlined below.

Q1: The Garfield Drive Historic District was listed in the NRHP in spring 2022. Some properties within the historic district look like they may fall within the APE.

A: Douglas Terpstra responded that if the historic district was listed that recently, it may not have been on the SHPO's historic resources GIS yet. It will be explored. Questioner will send an email with information.

Q2: If we want to provide comments about creating safer walking conditions, is there a certain committee that we join or just provide comments.

A: Comments can be shared at any time and at the public meeting this fall. CAC invites will be going out in October. Leave your contact information with a project team member if you're interested in serving. The project team is looking at lighting under walkways and other elements.

Q3: Online question about sharing the rationale for including pedestrian access on particular bridges.

A: We are only at about 30% of design, and we're still looking at big picture items. In our preliminary analysis, every crossing of the interstate has some pedestrian facilities except for Hanna. Indianapolis Department of Public Works (DPW) is interested in a corridor along Hanna. The wider replacement bridge will accommodate a pedestrian facility and the bridge will be raised some to provide clearance for trucks.

Q4: Several meeting participants commented on poor pedestrian conditions, including along Raymond Street and Morris Street. Sidewalks are narrow, and guardrail is low. There's heavy pedestrian traffic, but there are not sidewalks on both sides. It can be dangerous if a bicycle is trying to pass a pedestrian on the narrow sidewalk. Lighting is poor under overpasses.

A: Any bridge we are widening, we are going to provide additional underpass lighting. The project is only able to upgrade facilities within INDOT right-of-way. DPW coordination is needed for other improvements.

Q5: Who is the person that ultimately goes to DPW to present what the people in this room are asking for? Is it the people in this room or something the project team takes back to DPW or a combination?

A: Project team will be coordinating with DPW. Issues raised will be shared with DPW and direct outreach can be made by interested parties.

Q6: Meeting participant expresses concern how they have had some of these conversations before in the community and they have been told "That is how INDOT built it." There is going to be major advocacy for some of these neighborhood improvements.

A: We are looking specifically at the underpasses and lighting improvements. We'll also be looking at facilities currently available and coordinating with DPW. We want to hear issues and concerns that we need to be addressing. The CAC is a good venue for these comments. Let us know if you're interested in serving.

Q7: Brenda Freije from the Rethink Coalition will be providing comments regarding the potential improvements that can be made. Rethink Coalition will be putting together detailed comments. A focus is on considering how this project impacts the larger examination of the inner loop and the ProPEL Indy process that has recently been announced and making sure that we are looking at this from a systems perspective.

A: MP explains what ProPEL Indy is to the meeting participants. INDOT recently put out a Request for Proposals (RFP) and they have a website with more information, propelindy.com. INDOT is moving forward with steps to have a holistic study of the inner loop and the interchanges -- what is happening and what is possible. ProPEL Indy is distinct from the I-65 Safety & Efficiency project.

It's worth reiterating that much of the work with this project is taking advantage of the current pavement. Much of the widening is happening with the existing shoulder and maximizing what is already available.

Q8: Meeting participant provides a comment about the intersection of Shelby and Raymond. One of the top 10 dangerous intersections in the city. The city controls part of the lights and the state controls other parts of the lights and they don't match, which causes confusion.

A: Thanks for the comment. The local street intersection is not part of the I-65 S&E project.

Q9: Can you speak to the degree to which cumulative impact of decisions made on projects over time is considered under either Section 106 or NEPA or neither? Do these processes limit consideration to only the current project? Do they consider how previous projects that might not have had significant individual impact could have major impacts when taken together?

A: We look at all projects in the area. The project is being timed the way it is to coordinate with I-69, I-465 and North Split. ITS infrastructure will provide fiber backbones that connect to the traffic management center. They get real time traffic data and video footage of what is happening on the roads.

Bridge improvements with I-65 S&E are addressing needed maintenance and repairs. The work happening now will not prevent future improvements in the area.

Q10: Are you considering 4(f) impacts to park and recreations resources as part of the NEPA process?

A: Yes. We are aware of the several trails. We are taking all of that into consideration and coordinating with the Parks Department.

Q11: Will the new Hanna Avenue bridge have pedestrian access barrier?

A: No hard barrier is planned to help limit proposed right of way needs.

Q12: Will the pavement resurfacing be using rubberized asphalt to reduce noise impacts?

A: The southern end is concrete and will be the same material. The remaining project limits will be widened to the inside with Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA).

Q13: Given the pandemic shifts in traffic, what is the basis for the need for the additional capacity?

A: We are working with INDOT and traffic engineers to look at where we stand now and where we expect to be in 25 years to make sure we are recommending the best alternative for this project. Traffic numbers are returning to normal and there is a need for additional capacity for this corridor, especially for northbound in the morning and southbound in the PM. We are still finalizing that information.

Q14: Caitlin from SHPO comments that the Garfield Drive Historic District was listed in 2022 and is now on the Indiana Buildings, Bridges, and Cemeteries Map. From the map, it appears that one building in the district may very slightly overlap with the current APE.

A: We will take this information into consideration.

Q15: Question about right-of-way acquisition and possibility of displacements.

A: Currently the only place that we are buying right-of-way is near Hanna Ave. We are not displacing anyone. We are buying a limited right-of-way to accommodate a wider bridge at Hanna Avenue.

Q16: I think there is concern about what the work means for potential future projects. Could you go into a little more detail about what the service life is for some of these rehabs?

A: This project is tying into previous work in 2014-2015 when the South Split pavement was widened. We are going to provide a lane to tie into the South Split project. It does not hinder any other future projects for the South Split.

When a bridge is originally built, it is projected to last about 75-80 years, and there is maintenance along the way. Maintenance and improvements are needed now, but they will not prevent future long-term improvements in the area.

Q17: Question about how the Pleasant Run Parkway will be impacted. There is a committee called Reconnect Our Waterways. We have destination places along the trail.

A: Pleasant Run Parkway is part of the Indianapolis Park and Boulevard System Historic District. We will be examining the project's effects on the historic district as part of future work. If you think Reconnect Our Waterways should be a consulting party, please share contact information and the group will be added to the list.

Q18: Is there a recent traffic data that indicates that there is heavy traffic along Morris Prospect Bridge that requires another lane during peak hours?

A: Yes.

Q19: Can you add studying how to reduce traffic speeds on the exit lanes?

A: We will be looking at it and extending the deceleration distance. We are not doing rumble strips. Those are very noisy and disrupt a lot of people's lives. Law enforcement is key.

Q20: One of the reasons we are adding lanes in each direction is for safety improvements. Can you elaborate on why more lanes makes things safer?

A: Improving traffic flow will help improve safety. Rear-end crashes are common in congested areas where queues form and sudden weaving occurs.

Q21: Question about number of lanes at the Morris Street bridge

A: Two lanes of northbound that will go through to the North Split and a third lane will tie into the exit ramp to Washington Street.

Q22: When you add more lanes, do you just invite more cars? Is that not what will happen or what has been seen around the country so far?

A: We're providing the capacity to distribute and accommodate traffic and to accommodate future traffic needs.

This is our understanding of the items presented for discussion. Please inform Parsons and ASC in writing of any corrections/additions to the summary. If no written comments are received within seven (7) days of receipt of this summary, it will be considered finalized as written.