

FIRST COMMUNITY MEETINGS

INDOT and the Consultant Team hosted six informational meetings in October 2006, one in each planning section, to provide communities with information about the I-69 Community Planning Program and to solicit input on community needs. The meetings were targeted at municipal and county elected and appointed officials and professional staff, local leadership and economic development organizations, and regional groups. More than 100 community representatives participated in the series of meetings from 23 of the eligible communities and 4 additional communities (Figure 1). Representatives from the Indiana Economic Development Council and the Tier 2 master and section consultants also attended the meetings.

Figure 1
Attendance at Community Meetings

Section	Location	Date	Attendance	Eligible Communities in Attendance
1	Oakland City	October 16, 2006	13	Evansville, Oakland City, Gibson County, Vanderburgh County, Warrick County
2	Petersburg	October 11, 2006	16	Petersburg, Knox County, Pike County
3	Washington	October 17, 2006	9	Loogootee, Washington, Daviess County, Martin County
4	Linton	October 25, 2006	21	Bedford, Ellettsville, Linton, Greene County
5	Bloomington	October 26, 2006	24	Bloomington, Ellettsville, Monroe County
6	Martinsville	October 30, 2006	27	Greenwood, Indianapolis, Martinsville, Johnson County, Morgan County

*Ineligible communities in attendance: Elberfeld (1), Huntingburg (2), Stockton (4), Jackson Township (Greene County) (4), and Harrison Township (Morgan County) (6)

**Eligible communities missing: Bloomfield (4), Mooresville (6), Princeton (1), Spencer (5), Vincennes (2), Lawrence County (4), and Owen County (5)

The program at each meeting included a presentation on details of the I-69 Community Planning Program. The agenda is provided below (Figure 2). At strategic points in the presentation, attendees were asked to provide feedback. A few general observations are provided in Figure 3. A complete list of responses is shown below (Appendix A).

Figure 2
Generalized Meeting Agenda

- **Development of the I-69 Planning Program**
- **Interstates and Land Uses**
- **Discussion**
- **Questions and Answers**
- **Next Steps**

Appendix A Feedback from Community Meetings

Section 1 Meeting

Additional Local Issues

- Oakland City
 - Will be west of the city limits
 - Protect park
- Gibson County
 - Sewage problems
 - Drainage
 - Pigeon Creek flooding effects Vanderburgh, Warrick and Gibson counties
 - Concerned about needed overpasses; access on either side of the new road
- Vanderburgh County
 - Impact on I-164
 - Drainage

20-year Vision

- Gibson County
 - Economic development
 - Local government currently overwhelmed
- Warrick County
 - Connector road into industrial park
 - Abundance of jobs for young people
- Oakland City
 - Industrial park
- Evansville
 - Full Loop – Evansville -- 2 Bridges over River
 - Economic development
 - Growth

Grant Program

- Can we buy options on land with the grant? No.
- Is there a match requirement? No, INDOT is providing the 20% match for the federal funds
- How much money is available in the grant program? \$1.5 million total.
- Are MPO's eligible?
- Can communities split the target amount among two projects? One cooperative project and one individual? Will consider.
- What is the time limit for applying for a grant?

Toolbox

- Stormwater management tools
- Basic inventory data
- Case studies
- Worst/best practices
- Best practices of commercial on interstate (Indiana and nationally)
- Comprehensive planning
- Effect on infrastructure
- Freight

- Land uses
- Interchange land use planning
- Infrastructure

Section 2 Meeting

Additional Local Issues

- Pike County
 - Environmental resources are beloved
 - Future development potential to increase tax base
 - Significant reliance on coal and agriculture; need to diversify
 - Managed/steady growth, but not explosive
 - Controlled economic development
 - Do not want to lose opportunity
 - Look at education tools – what is appropriate?
 - Plan infrastructure for economic development and growth
 - SR 267 to Plainfield provides opportunity
 - Currently a bedroom community; hopes that I-69 will allow people to both live and work here
- Dubois County
 - Connection (Huntingburg) to I-69 SR 64
 - Western part of Huntingburg may benefit
 - Rail access
 - Fiber optics corridor to SR64
 - Thinking of new technologies
 - Major announcement coming in Huntingburg
- Petersburg
 - SR 57 is currently the main route
 - Capitalize on truck and commuter traffic
 - Concern about maintaining identity
 - Concern about maintaining downtown
 - Expand planning and zoning to 2-mile fringe
 - Annexation
 - Plan at interchange
 - Utilities are good at one of the possible interchanges; not good at the other
 - Need to update planning tools (zoning is 16 years old)
- Knox County
 - On main rail corridor
 - Negative impact on development currently along US 41
 - Need forward thinking engineering
 - Preservation of access
- General
 - Road will help to market coal resources
 - Concerns about the impact of uncontrolled growth on farmland
 - Planning has been ongoing, however with I-69, plans have been on hold until decisions have been made
 - The importance of coordination among neighboring communities
 - The location and number of interchanges are unknown
 - Treading water on other planning issues because I-69 could significantly impact

Grant Program

- Want quicker access to monies
- Will this program be affected by the rules for CFF program regarding number of open grants in a community at one time (Office of Comm. Rural Affairs)
- How do these grants integrate with OCRA
- Coordination of applications between communities by evaluators
- Timing of Toolbox
- Submit letter of intent
- Is a zoning ordinance an eligible activity? Yes.

Toolbox

- Comprehensive Plans
- Visioning
- Types of Consultants/Resources
- Don't reinvent the wheel

Section 3 Meeting

Additional Local Issues

- Washington
 - How do we manage growth; Encourage real new growth vs. relocated growth
 - Annexations
 - Currently not a lot of industrial development
 - Concerns about maintaining downtown vibrancy
- Protect West Bonds Park that serves as a "state park" for the local area
 - Concern/demographics changing
 - Lake 650 acres with trails
 - Only jointly owned Co. Park in state
- Joint county parks dept.
- Relationship to projected tourism in Orange County
- I-69 likely to attract industrial development
- US 50 and US 231 more likely to attract tourism
- Traffic patterns of Amish
- West Gate at Crane (industrial park)
- Flash flooding in Shoals and Loogootee
- Elnora and Odon likely to experience impact from I-69; not included as eligible communities
- Standing local working group to meet and discuss common issues presented by new I-69 would be useful

20-year Vision

- Washington
 - Growth, but not primary goal
 - Rising incomes/workforce development
 - Enhanced assessed valuation
 - Become a multi-community commercial hub
 - Maintain small community QOL/no sprawl
- Daviess County
 - Varied visions
 - Better regional transportation

- Hub for tourism; capitalize on Amish heritage
- Loogootee
 - Need place to start planning
 - Growth
 - Address neglected tourism – environmentally related
- General
 - Capitalize on interesting terrain
 - Add services to park functions: greenways, trails, linkages to statewide rec. plans
 - Opportunities to collaborate
 - QOL important to people who will work at Crane

Impediments

- Gap in planning (Ex. Wash. Has, Martin, Daviess, Loogootee do not)
- Lack of funding. How do you implement in light of declining revenues?
- Need to shift some responsibilities of implementation to developing community
- Overcoming mindset that people don't want zoning
- Inability to annex

Grant Program

- Consider bonus points to grant requests based on certain factors.
- Flexibility in timing on grant program (how detailed)
- Can communities apply for a joint grant and an individual grant (group \$70,000 for 3 communities → leave the rest for the communities individually)
- Can communities use grant funds for options on land?
- Can communities apply for multiple grants?
- Does grant include research/inventory?
- Can funding be used for infrastructure planning?
- How much detail needed for application?
- Water/Sewer extension studies?
- Can we use funds to match other programs (ex. LWCF, Rec plans)
- Could two communities work together and then utilize funds to zero in on one community?
- For transportation planning, to address new road patterns?

Toolbox

- How to do Request for Proposals and Requests for Qualifications
- Tools to educate public about controversial tools, public relations
- Provide sample ordinances
- Provide related resources.
- Opportunities for education
- Indicate issues addressed and pros/cons for each tool
- Best/worst practices
- What are developers looking for?
- Linking economic development and local tax revenue
- Best practices of commercial on interstate (Indiana and nationally)
- Helpful to show how communities fund ongoing planning
- Comprehensive planning
- Will there be focus on tourism?

Section 4 Meeting

Additional Local Issues

- Greene County
 - No planning in Greene County. The term planning is problematic, sounds like zoning
 - Lots of emotion surrounding planning and zoning
 - Lack of zoning may limit the potential benefits of the road
 - Solutions can't be overwhelming or overcontrolling
 - Don't yet have a vision
 - Poorer county: low incomes and few fiscal resources
 - Implementation of anything currently relies on a few volunteers; need to staffing
 - No full time economic development director; would have to double the salary currently available to attract
 - East Greene County is growing as bedroom community for Bloomington –New school and light manufacturing
- Ellettsville
 - Grown from 3,000 population to 6,000 in the last 15 years
 - Advantages and disadvantages to being near Bloomington
 - Need a mindset that will accept change
 - Have a new redevelopment commission
 - SR 46 goes through town
- Linton
 - Much like Greene County
 - Limited resources
 - Folks in the room are the volunteers that do everything
 - Has formed an advisory plan commission and is working on first comprehensive plan
- Bedford
 - Not a lot of discussion in the community
 - Access management
 - City has zoning; county does not
- Lawrence County
 - Similar issues
 - Limestone area: local heritage, important for building construction
 - Farming—mainly pasture, not many row crops or logging
 - Depth to bedrock approximately two feet

20-year Vision

- Greene County
 - Goose Pond – National Tourist Destination
 - West Gate Project
 - Planned Mining industry in western part of county
 - Growth
 - Identity – unique but compatible with others
- Ellettsville
 - Downtown – post office/employment
- Linton
 - West Gate Project
 - Tech jobs – medium – basic manufacturing
- Bedford
 - Better infrastructure - water/sewer/streets – to support economic development

- Large employers along corridor
- Lawrence County
 - Retain current jobs
 - East Gate opportunities

Impediments

- Some very strong negative opinions about issues such as planning and zoning
- Control access point to interstate (needs to be done right)
- Distance of some communities from corridor

Grant Program

- How long will the application period be? We would like as much flexibility as possible.
- What organizations are eligible? Executive/legislative bodies of eligible cities, towns, and counties.
- Source of funds? Federal 80%, State Match 20%
- Help to do grant program/process
- Will the Lt. Governor's office extend the Breaking the Boundaries deadlines that come up soon?
- Partnering allowed? Yes.
- Need as much help as possible; volunteers are getting tired

Toolbox

- Educational tools on the benefits of zoning and corridor planning
- Comp. Plan
- Highway/Roadway plan
- Sample forms, ideas, etc.
- Step by Step
- Models
- Websites
- Existing projects/community – contact info.
- How to hire a consultant
- Education about benefits of long-term planning
- Maps – IN RR bought new land for track
- GIS Atlas, Google Atlas and other tools
- Successful examples – mistakes, things to do
- Case studies (good and bad)
- Update toolbox in the future
- Sustainability
- Links to other compatible/comparable grant programs/ways to fund
- IU Bloomington – SPEA Service Corps Program--assist at lower cost
- Links to other grant program
- Really basic information; will be starting from scratch
- Successful planning in other highway segments

Section 5 Meeting

Additional Local Issues

- Boundaries between INDOT and local responsibilities
- Access to and across new highway
- Issues facing communities farther removed from corridor

- Traffic on nearby roads
- Development in corridor before construction.
- Historic preservation issues and tools
- Protect small local businesses
- Effect of interchange on traffic
- Frontage roads in Bloomington/Monroe County
- Effects expected from changing SR 37 from freeway to a tollway; effects on traffic patterns
- Historic farms in Monroe County
- Could create sprawl that does not fit with the aesthetic preferences/character/culture of Bloomington
- Inter-county collaboration land use
- Need to address land uses in areas of the corridor that are not currently developed
- Hills and forest prevent development in some places
- Noise issues
- Diversion of transportation money from more desired projects
- Limited fiscal options to deal with the effects on corridors adjacent to the new road
- Limit billboards
- Bloomington and Monroe County are fairly current on planning and zoning
 - Monroe County will undergo a review of its comprehensive plan next year
 - Bloomington revised comprehensive plan last year; currently working on ordinance updates
 - Current comprehensive plans don't address the impact of the new road
- Concerns about interchanges/development issues
 - Superfund site—closed landfill
 - Current TIF on Fullerton Pike (hospital)
 - Second Street has retail and light manufacturing, including a vacant Walmart site
 - North Park—a mixed use PUD west of SR 37 on SR 46—will begin building soon
 - Maple Grove Historic District is on the National Register
 - Third St.
 - Walnut St. includes areas in floodplain
 - Kinser Pike has a TIF district and is available for development
 - Simpson Road—opportunity for development
 - Oliver Winery
 - Sample Road—old houses and yards—community development potential
 - Chambers Pike—not feasible, won't do
 - Paragon—didn't work, won't do
 - Liberty Church includes flat valley that one family wants to continue to farm. It's only a matter of time.

20-year Vision

- Planned growth
- Do not envision as SR 37 as a toll facility
- Hard to envision future
- SR 46 to four lanes through Spencer
- Monroe/Bloomington greater regional player in education, employment, retail, and life sciences
- More investment in alternative transportation enhancements
 - Multi-Modal centers/transfers
 - Park and Ride
- Access to Indy airport
- Capitalize on SR 46 connection to I-70 to enhance medical device cluster/corridor

Grant Program

- Encouraging collaboration; will there be points for collaboration?
- Want flexibility in timing

Toolbox

- Best practices for regional collaboration and economic planning
- Access to state atlas data
- Data and sample studies of particular issue areas
- National best practices to provide INDOT ideas/direction on road design to address noise, runoff, frontage roads
- Need to assess how I-64 has retained its character
- Site reclamation/big box redevelopment
- Billboard/Signage

Section 6 Meeting

Additional Community Issues

- Johnson County
 - Anticipation of road construction is stifling current economic investment; could get worse as construction nears
 - Splitting farms
 - Uncertainty of freeway vs. toll road
 - White River
- Morgan County
 - East/west access across I-69
 - Bike/pedestrian access across I-69 (potential cross-sections for Toolbox)
 - Potential effect on Morgan-Monroe State Forest
 - County has a preliminary greenways plan that is current being updated
- Greenwood
 - I-65 is the primary economic development corridor; Greenwood will be less affected by I-69 because of distance
- Indianapolis
 - Expect impact on parallel arterials
- Current road planning has not addressed flooding issues

20-year Vision

- Greenwood
 - East/west corridor across Johnson County that is integrated with I-69 (west of river area in particular)
 - Will want to collaborate with the county to maximize positive impacts
- Johnson County
 - Need an economic development vision
 - The most direct impact will be on NW Johnson County, White River Township
 - Major opportunities taken advantage of in a managed manner
 - Regionalization of Indy Metro counties – planning at regional level
 - Potential effects of the proposed outer loop
 - Need to connect transportation plans with Morgan County
 - Corridor from I-65 to SR 67
 - Capitalize on Bio-crossroads Corridor (Bloomington → Indy)
- Morgan County

- Need for growth management, particularly in light of some rolling terrain
- Opportunities for economic development, industrial development; currently an industrial park south of Martinsville with a TIF for infrastructure
- Tremendous opportunity for growth
- That over 20 years, growth is managed and environmentally special areas are protected
- Indianapolis
 - Anticipate economic growth in the Southport Road area

Impediments

- Greenwood/Johnson County
 - Lack of detailed/articulated vision
 - No solution to bridging White River
 - No east/west corridor
 - Frontage roads
 - No infrastructure on the west side of White River Township
 - 144 – 4 lanes
- Martinsville/Morgan County
 - No wastewater treatment until Martinsville
 - Waverly served by a package treatment plant
 - Rebuild SR 39; drainage issues
 - Few funds available

Grant Program

- Are grants fully-funded? Yes.
- Can you use internal staff or a consultant? Either.
- What is the source of funding? 80% Federal, 20% state match.
- Do federal rules apply? The program is expected to be very much like the Local Federal Aid Program.
- How many applications per community? One.
- How wide an area can an application include? Can the application include both the county and the municipalities in the county? Yes.
- What local approval is required? Resolution by the legislative body.
- Is it possible to get more than \$50,000? Current target is \$50,000. Some discussion about providing incentives for some behaviors such as interlocal cooperation.
- How were eligible communities determined? Began with a 5-mile buffer around the proposed alignment; selected by the Tier 1 I-69 Task Force that included the INDOT Commissioner; added additional communities after initial announcement.

Toolbox

- Farmland preservation (existing tools and new tools that may be needed)
 - Alternatives to minimum lot size (does not work well here)
- Visioning; ways to set priorities
- Design standards for bike lanes: standards, photos – make sure tool can be used for other presentations (delete logos, make memory friendly)
- Pros and cons of various tools
- New Hampshire program
- Multi-modal options
- Right-of-way design
- Land acquisition