



# Noblesville E-W Corridor Community Advisory Committee - Meeting Minutes

Project: Noblesville E-W Corridor Project No.: INDOT Des. No. TBD  
 Location: Hybrid In-person at City CHA Proj. No.: 059473  
 Hall & Web Conference  
 Meeting Date/Time: November 12, 2020 - 1:00 PM - 03:00PM

## Invited Members:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Virtual/ In-person</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Email</u>
Mary Noble for Bob DuBois	Virtual	Noblesville Chamber of Commerce	bob@noblesvillechamber.com
Danielle Burrow	Virtual	Pleasant View Baptist Church	pleasantviewbcn@gmail.com
Sandy Stewart	Virtual	Noblesville Preservation Alliance	info@noblesvillepreservation.com
Paula Gilliam	In-person	Southwest Quad	pg7am@aol.com
Jim Coffey Sr./Jim Coffey III	In-person	Doves Court	jimcoffey@att.net
Brenda Myers	In-person	Hamilton County Tourism, Inc.	bmyers@hamiltoncountytourism.com
Lorna Oskouie	Virtual	Noblesville Main Street	lorna@noblesvillemainstreet.org
Alison Krupski, P.E.	Virtual	City of Noblesville, Engineering Department	akrupski@noblesville.in.us
Jim Hellmann, P.E.	In-person	City of Noblesville, Engineering Department	jhellmann@noblesville.in.us
Andrew Rodewald, P.E.	In-person	City of Noblesville, Engineering Department	arodewald@noblesville.in.us
Chris Gellinger	In-person	City of Noblesville, Fire Department	Cgellinger@noblesville.in.us
Wil Hampton	In-person	City of Noblesville, Common Council	whampton@noblesville.in.us
Pete Schwartz	In-person	City of Noblesville, Common Council	pschwartz@noblesville.in.us
Jack Martin	In-person	City of Noblesville, Board of Public Works & Safety	Jack@martinandmartin.biz
Brad Davis	In-person	Hamilton County Highway Department	bradley.davis@hamiltoncounty.in.gov
Matt Lee	In-person	Hamilton County Highway Department	matt.lee@hamiltoncounty.in.gov
Jim Neal	In-person	Hamilton County Highway Department	james.neal@hamiltoncounty.in.gov
<i>The following were invited, yet were unable to attend:</i>			
Andrea Davis		HAND, Inc.	andrea@handincorporated.org
Seth Leeman		Noblesville Baptist Church	pastorleeman@noblesvillebaptist.org
Rev. Cheryl Russell		First Christian Church	reception@fccnoblesville.org
Jesse Garner		The Mill Church (First Church of the Nazarene)	office@millchurchnoblesville.org
Jenn Johnson		Genesis Church Inc.	jjohnson@genesischurch.me
Mark Dollase		Indiana Landmarks, Central Region	mdollase@indianalandmarks.org
Desiree Scott		River Run Community Assoc., Inc.	info@duepnerlaw.com
Jason Spartz		Westbrook Mobile Home Village	jasonspartz@gmail.com
John Frank		Wellington Northeast Neighborhood Assoc., Inc.	wannahoa@gmail.com
Sarah Reed		City of Noblesville, Community & Economic Dev.	sreed@noblesville.in.us
Chad Knecht		City of Noblesville, Public Safety	cknecht@noblesville.in.us

John Mann		City of Noblesville, Police Department	jmann@noblesville.in.us
Marnie Cooke		Noblesville Schools, Marketing & Communications	marnie_cooke@nobl.k12.in.us
Dr. David Mundy		Noblesville Schools, Associate Superintendent	dave_mundy@nobl.k12.in.us
Dr. Heather Hendrich		Noblesville Schools, Director of Safety and Security	heather_hendrich@nobl.k12.in.us
Brian Zachery		Noblesville Schools, Director of Transportation	brian_zachery@nobl.k12.in.us

## Observers:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Virtual/ In-person</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Email</u>
Jay Merrell	In-person	IDI Composites	jmerrell@idicomposites.com
Luke Kenley	In-person	South-side Noblesville Businessman	n/a
<i>The following were invited, yet were unable to attend:</i>			
Bill & Debbie Jamison		Southwest Quad - observer (call in)	minitonasbill@gmail.com
Mike Corbett		Southwest Quad	mcorbett@hamiltoncountybusiness.com

## Project Team:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Virtual/ In-person</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Email</u>
Robert Winebrinner	In-person	CHA Consulting, Inc.	rwinebrinner@chacompanies.com
Trevor Wieseke	In-person	CHA Consulting, Inc.	twieseke@chacompanies.com
Mike Maurovich, P.E.	In-person	American Structurepoint, Inc.	MMAurovich@structurepoint.com
Tanner McKinney, P.E.	In-person	American Structurepoint, Inc.	TMcKinney@structurepoint.com
Jennifer Beck	Virtual	INDOT, Greenfield District	JBeck@indot.IN.gov
Linda Weintraut, Ph.D.	Virtual	Weintraut & Associates, Inc.	linda@weintrautinc.com
Matt Brown, P.E.	Virtual	A&F Engineering	mbrown@af-eng.com
Brandon Arnold, P.E.	Virtual	USI Consultants, Inc.	barnold@usiconsultants.com

- Agenda Item 1 - Welcome Back and Re-introductions
- American Structurepoint, Inc. (Structurepoint), acting as the meeting Moderator, started the meeting with introductions through roll call by organization/member.
  - Invited parties not in attendance are listed above.
- Structurepoint explained the purpose of the meeting and the role of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) in the context of the project development process.
  - The meeting guidelines were announced, which included recognition of invited CAC members, project team, and observers. The Moderator explained the reasoning with a select group of representatives and how limiting responses would help to keep the meeting on track.
  - The purpose of the CAC meeting is for the project team to gather input from leaders of organizations within the community, and for those leaders to inform and update their membership.
- Agenda Item 2 – Selection of the Preferred Alternative
- CHA Consulting, Inc. (CHA) then began by explaining the purpose of an Alternatives Screening Memo and Alternatives Screening Matrix. The Screening Matrix and documentation in the Screening Memo is used to document the efforts to compare and contrast the considered corridors and screen out those alternatives that do not meet the purpose and need. The Screening also aids in determining which alternative presents the least

environmental impact. The results of the screening are examined to determine whether a Preferred Alternative should be selected for further, detailed investigation.

- CHA pointed out the Matrix in Appendix A of the Memo and the maps in Appendix B. They noted the new map showing the currently considered corridors, as well as the previously considered corridors (marked by red dashed lines). They reiterated that corridors further from downtown provided less traffic reduction and those corridors at 191<sup>st</sup> Street or 161<sup>st</sup> Street provide negligible reductions for Conner Street, which is this project's need.
- CHA noted the remote data methodology for calculating the estimated impacts for each corridor. The robust data from the state GIS, Geographic Information System, was used to compare environmental impacts across all corridors equally. GIS data is beneficial during conceptual alternatives development, as the data allows the project team and the City to avoid costly investigations of each corridor.
- CHA explained the Screening Matrix, pointing out the layout of Alternatives in each column and environmental impact categories in each row. CHA then presented a few examples of the impacts and pointed out that the lowest impact amount in each category is highlighted in the table. Some Alternatives tied for lowest impact and were both highlighted.
- During discussion of the relocation category of impact, Mr. Merrell asked which particular businesses were counted towards the 8 listed for the B alternatives.
  - CHA noted that the methodology was conceptual and not included in the memo, however, the project design team would follow-up.
- Mr. Merrell also asked about the difference between the B and B1 alternatives, as it pertained to the "Listed Historic Districts Affected" category in the matrix. He specifically asked why the B Alternative was listed as 1 and the B1 was listed as 0.
  - CHA noted that given the constraints of comparing these corridors conceptually, the design team chose to represent the difference as one and zero. Though there may be impact to the Plum Prairie Historic District by the B1 Alternative, the intent of considering that alternative is to avoid the district and the zero is a representation of that intent. An impact to Plum Prairie Historic District is guaranteed with the B Alternative.
- CHA continued by discussing the 'Engineering Considerations' section of the table, noting that these elements were considered in conjunction with the environmental impacts and were not a major determining factor.
- CHA finished the discussion of the Matrix by pointing out the project Purpose and Need and the determination of significant congestion reduction being determined to be 20% reduction in traffic volumes.
  - CHA defined the 20% reduction to the attendees as the amount of traffic volume (in average daily traffic or ADT) required to ensure that the future year (2045) would have traffic volumes no greater than currently exist on S.R. 32/Connor Street (approximately 15,000 ADT).
- Ms. Myers asked about the model used to determine the traffic volumes in the future year, specifically how the model projects future volumes. She asked whether specific development was taken into account or whether broader trends in projected economic and population growth were used.
  - Structurepoint responded that the models account for growth using a growth factor that considers the potential for development. Specific developments are not included as they are not known at the time of the study. A higher growth rate was selected for this project than a project in a completely rural area that does not anticipate any development.
- Mr. Hampton inquired about the significance of the 24% traffic volume reduction presented by the B Alternatives and asked whether this is typically the reduction sought on a thoroughfare project.
  - A&F Engineering provided response on the threshold of 20% on this project and noted that the reduction for a project is dependent on the type of roadway. He noted that more generally a 15-30% reduction in traffic is considered a goal of a project of this type.

- Mr. Hampton supposed that more detail concerning the B and B1 alternatives may be needed to determine whether the traffic reduction (24%) from the B alternatives justifies the project cost.
- Mr. Merrell continued the discussion about traffic volume reduction by stating that a more thorough cost-benefit analysis would be needed to know whether the 24% reduction was a benefit to the community more broadly.
  - CHA responded that cost effectiveness figures are available for the project and that the B alternatives do provide the most effective traffic volume reduction per dollar spent. However, CHA noted that a full cost-benefit analysis would require a much larger study than is standard for this type of project.
  - Mr. Merrell concurred with the cost effectiveness of a shorter corridor route, yet he emphasized that the city council should weigh the costs and benefits to the community.
- CHA noted that this project has been considered since 1995 and that the City has made efforts since that time to alleviate traffic congestion downtown. This includes upgrades to the Logan Street bridge, the construction of the 186<sup>th</sup> Street/Field Drive connection from S.R. 37 to S.R. 19, west of the White River, and traffic light and lane marking updates on Conner Street downtown.
- CHA explained that Alternative A is blacked out on the matrix, because it does not reduce traffic downtown and therefore does not meet the Purpose and Need.
- CHA continued by outlining the purpose of the Alternatives Screening Memo, which is to briefly present the alternatives considered and then describe the relative impacts of each major category of environmental impact. The impacts are discussed by type and alternatives are discussed from greatest to lowest impact.
- CHA then presented the B1 – Pleasant Street alternative as the Preferred Alternative, due to the overall lowest environmental impacts and the benefit of less costly and complex engineering and design. CHA then opened the discussion to any comments/questions/concerns regarding the Preferred Alternative, the selection process, or the impacts determined and documented in the matrix.
- Mr. Martin asked about the possibility of removing trucks from S.R. 32/Conner Street and diverting those trucks to 146<sup>th</sup> Street. He stated that his idea is modeled after the relinquishment of SR 431 to Keystone Avenue and the removal of trucks from that roadway segment.
  - Structurepoint noted that the S.R. 32 roadway is an INDOT asset and that 146<sup>th</sup> Street is a Hamilton County asset. Any changes to truck traffic would require extensive coordination between the two.
  - Ms. Beck with INDOT also answered the question by noting that while the effort requires extensive coordination between INDOT and the county, S.R. 32 is also designated by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) as a National Truck Route. Therefore, the FHWA would also be party to the negotiation. This type of agreement would also require a significant study.
- Ms. Myers asked about the waters (waterways and wetland) impacts shown on the matrix and whether the impacts at each location were known.
  - CHA noted that impacts to waterways were considered as a count and not acreage, due to the conceptual nature of the corridors considered in the screening. However, any alternative that impacts a waterway will require equal permitting effort. The detailed design, as part of the permitting process, must show efforts to ‘avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate’ impact for any alternative chosen. Structurepoint noted that impacts to wetlands were considered for the full width of the conceptual 120-foot cross-section, as a worst-case scenario.
- Ms. Myers then asked about impacts to the Environmental Justice populations and why the narrative noted all 5 populations would be affected by the project.
  - CHA responded with a brief definition of Environmental Justices (EJ) populations, which are low-income and minority populations that were historically disadvantaged or excluded from planning efforts. The environmental process provides that we ensure equal access to participate and also that the project consider impacts to any population.

- CHA noted that the impacts are considered by Census Tract and that all 5 tracts that encompass the considered corridors contain EJ populations. Therefore, each corridor will affect at least one EJ population. However, there is the potential for impact across corridors.
- CHA also noted that the project has already included efforts to identify and include low-income and Hispanic populations within Noblesville in the planning process.
- CHA mentioned the desire of the City to provide design that fits the context of the community. This is all part of an overall effort named Context Sensitive Solution, which is “an approach that leads to preserving and enhancing scenic, aesthetic, historic, community, and environmental resources, while improving or maintaining safety, mobility, and infrastructure condition.”
- CHA concluded discussion of the Screening with a reminder to all attendees that the project team accepts feedback throughout the process and that comments were welcomed after the meeting.
- Agenda Item 3 – Group Discussion
- Structurepoint pointed out that the city intends to pursue state funding for this project, and therefore is following a specific process so that the project will not be disqualified from receiving state funds in the future. The project team has been working closely with INDOT in order to make sure the process is being followed.
  - The study currently undertaken by the project team, on behalf of the City, is the full length from S.R. 32 and Hague Road to S.R. 37, crossing the White River, to provide logical termini for the purposes of complying with state environmental planning guidance. Breaking the project into phases to avoid troublesome environmental aspects of the alignment is considered “segmentation” and would jeopardize the state funding.
- The alternatives analysis has been reviewed by INDOT, Environmental Services Division and the project has been approved to proceed with the preferred alternative B-1 as recommended by the project team. The city is moving forward with the B-1 alternative, and therefore the following discussion should focus on seeking input about the details of the Preferred Alternative alignment and conceptual cross-section. With the designation of the B1 Alternative as the Preferred Alternative, design will begin in more detail.
  - The road cross section is a vertical section of the roadway at right angle to the centerline of the roadway, including all elements of the road from the right-of-way line (lanes, shoulders, retaining walls, curbs, medians, pavement structure, roadside slopes, ditches, bike lanes and sidewalks).
  - The road alignment is the route of the road, defined as a series of horizontal tangents and curves. This is the overhead visualization on aerial imagery, maps, and plans that is typically presented.
- The alignment of the B1 – Pleasant Street alternative will begin at S.R. 32 and Hague Road and traverse generally southeast to cross Cicero Creek, routing between potential wetlands and adjacent homes on Cherry Tree Road. There will be a crossing of Pleasant Street over Cicero Creek. The alignment will then meet the former Midland-Trace railroad bed and continue, intersecting with River Road and then continuing on across the White River using a bridge. The rail bed will be followed east to the general area of 5<sup>th</sup> Street & Vine Street, where the roadway will need to ‘thread the needle’ between the adjacent business to the north (IDI Composites) and the Plum Prairie Historic District. The alignment will then follow 8<sup>th</sup> Street south to meet the existing Pleasant Street alignment, which will be followed east to 19<sup>th</sup> Street. Intersections along the existing alignment of Pleasant Street will be assessed and type of intersection will be determined based on traffic patterns at each intersection. The alignment will terminate at the recently constructed roundabout at Pleasant Street and 19<sup>th</sup>, however, the roundabout may be modified to receive the upgraded roadway.
  - Mr. Merrell asked whether the S.R. 32/Hague Road/Pleasant Street intersection will be a roundabout.
    - Structurepoint noted that the intersection at that location will depend on close coordination with INDOT regarding other concurrent projects on S.R. 32. In particular the currently programmed INDOT project to add travel lanes to S.R. 32 at this location.

- Ms. Beck with INDOT reiterated that the City and INDOT are in coordination regarding the Noblesville E-W Corridor Project and other projects where local and INDOT assets interact with one another, such as S.R. 32 on the west side of Noblesville.
    - Mr. Hellmann noted that the city is advocating for a roundabout at this location.
- Structurepoint noted in the discussion of alignment how the various environmental features, surrounding properties, and overall connectivity of the community will be considered in design of the alignment.
- Structurepoint also pointed out that along the alignment a typical section is being considered that is not more than 4 lanes in a boulevard style. This would include 1 to 2 lanes in each direction, but specific elements are not available at this point.
- Mr. Coffey asked about the width of a 120-foot corridor, particularly west of White River and River Road.
  - Structurepoint highlighted the area and noted that the 120-foot width was worst-case scenario and used to give each corridor equal consideration in the screening process. The cross-section of the Pleasant Street alignment will vary and will depend on traffic volumes and surrounding conflicts and/or environmental concerns.
- The group discussed the challenge in placing the alignment of Pleasant Street to fit between the bounds of the Plum Prairie Historic District and the IDI Composites facility adjacent to the north.
  - Mr. Kenley noted that IDI is a respected, international company that provides positive value to the community. He expressed worry that a substantial impact on IDI may cause the business to relocate outside of the community or the state entirely.
  - Mr. Kenley pointed out that the Plum Prairie Historic District was very recently listed on the National Register of Historic Places and posed a question for the design team regarding the feasibility of modifying the District boundary.
    - CHA noted that the district was listed on the register in 2018.
  - Linda Weintraut provided a historian's expertise on the matter. She pointed out that the Plum Prairie Historic District is listed both on the state and federal registers of historic places. Modification or other challenges to the historic listing would be onerous and would likely take a significant commitment of time to pursue. She noted that the historic justifications of the listing are valid and so any effort to modify or change the district may prove ultimately unfruitful.
  - Mr. Merrell corrected the date of listing of the district to January of 2019 and pointed out that the district was listed as having "local significance" in history.
    - *Clarification: Mr. Merrell was correct in the date of listing on the state register. The district was nominated in January 2017, listed on the state register in January 2019 and then listed on the federal register in March 2019.*
  - Linda noted that the levels of significance (local, state, or national history) do not change the eligibility for the state or federal Register of Historic Places.
  - Structurepoint noted the concern with this segment of alignment and ensured the group that the project team is looking to work with all parties to find a solution.
- Mr. Kenley noted that portions of the conversation regarding alignment options came across as though the state was a hurdle to overcome or an "adversary." He expressed a desire to look at the state as a partner and work cooperatively.
  - The project team agreed fully that the relationship with INDOT is collaborative and not adversarial.
  - Ms. Beck with INDOT responded that they have processes that must be followed; however, they are working closely with the City and project team to ensure open communication and partnership with transportation planning.

- Structurepoint pointed out that many design details still need to be made, including local truck traffic and the need to accommodate them with any roundabouts installed. Regardless of intersection type, the project will be designed to safely accommodate the truck traffic that is expected on the roadway.
- Schwartz asked whether an alignment could be considered that would follow a path through the floodplain to avoid impacts to Plum Prairie HD or IDI.
  - CHA responded that many parcels between White River and Plum Prairie HD are encumbered by FEMA deed restrictions. The City purchased these parcels with the use of FEMA grant money that was intended to remove obstructions from the floodplain and thereby reduce liabilities for the National Flood Insurance Program. As a condition of this grant program, the properties have deed restrictions that do not permit placement of fill required for the construction of a roadway.
  - Mr. Hellmann, Assistant City Engineer, reinforced that these properties are not available for the alignment due to restrictions noted by CHA. During previous discussions, the former City Engineer John Beery had met with the FEMA regulators in Chicago to discuss refunding the FEMA funds in order to lift the deed restrictions on the properties. This conversation was a “non-starter” with FEMA.
  - Mr. Kenley pondered whether the project team’s efforts in interpreting the regulations may be better spent in requesting assistance from U.S. Representative-elect Victoria Spartz; who may advocate for the project from her position in Congress. Sometimes the regulators are interpreting the will of their superiors and now that we have a representative in Congress the relationship could be leveraged to receive a favorable outcome for the FEMA parcels.
  - Mr. Martin agreed that someone should talk to U.S. Representative-elect Spartz.
- Mr. Coffey asked which homes would be taken west of the river, west of River Road and noted that neighborhood north of the railroad has homes made on wooden foundations.
  - Structurepoint noted that the alignment is tightest at this location and that design will examine the impacts closely to minimize as much as feasible. He noted that it is in the city’s best interest to avoid excess property acquisition.
    - Mr. Hellmann stated the decision considers both economic cost and number of residents impacted.
  - Mr. Martin asked for the width of the existing Midland-Trace abandoned rail corridor.
    - Mr. Hellmann responded that although the project is not through right-of-way engineering and the exact area is somewhat uncertain due to confusing title transfers, the former railroad corridor is generally 40-50 feet wide.
- Mr. Martin inquired about an alignment that would angle south of the IDI parking lot and connect directly into the intersection with Pleasant and 8<sup>th</sup> Street.
  - Structurepoint noted that there would be safety concerns with an acute intersection angle between 8<sup>th</sup> and the proposed Pleasant Street alignment. In order to mitigate safety and turning issues this would likely result in greater impacts to the area. There is also a church on the corner of 8<sup>th</sup> and Walnut that is contributing to the historic district that would be relocated in this suggested alternative.
  - Mr. Merrell and Ms. Gilliam noted that the church at 8<sup>th</sup> and Walnut was recently moved there and was not part of the original district.
- Ms. Gilliam noted that the industrial facility of IDI fits the history of the Plum Prairie/SW Quad neighborhood and that long-term residents of the neighborhood are accustomed to the presence. She also noted that the church at 6<sup>th</sup> and Walnut is of significance.
- CHA reminded the attendees that the project team is accepting feedback on-going with further design and environmental investigation. This includes elements of design that integrate the project into the surrounding

community, discussed as Community Context Solutions (in official jargon as Context Sensitive Solutions) in the meeting, and any elements the City should include to ensure proportionate impact to Environmental Justice communities.

- Agenda Item 4 – Next Steps
- CHA noted the upcoming steps in the planning and design process, including: the official public announcement of the Preferred Alternative, project website with project information, design of the Preferred Alternative, detailed environmental investigations, and further public feedback at the next public information meeting.
- CHA asked that everyone disseminate the information about the project and upcoming meeting to the groups they represent.
- Speaking on behalf of the City Engineer, Structurepoint reiterated that the city intends to proceed with the B-1 alternative based on an aggressive schedule to complete the project, therefore details on design and impacts will be made available soon. The project team welcomes input from the CAC members and their organizations about the B-1 alternative as the project progresses. The city also emphasized their willingness to discuss the project and answer questions from the CAC and attendees.
  - Mr. Kenley reiterated that the city should still explore the use of FEMA property, even if it means contacting the U.S. Congressional Representative for Noblesville to open communication channels with the federal agency and exert influence on the process of re-acquiring the properties from FEMA and removing property restrictions for use with this project.
- Agenda Item 5 – Wrap-up
- After asking for any additional input, Structurepoint adjourned the meeting.

*Please Note: Due to challenges with the hybrid meeting format and difficulty in picking up in-person comments with the microphone, there was no recording made of the meeting.*