



## MEETING MINUTES

**Date:** July 20, 2017  
**Time:** 9:30 –11:15 AM CT  
**Meeting:** I-69 ORX IAC Meeting #2  
**Location:** Worsham Hall, Henderson, KY

### List of Attendees

Name	Organization	Email
<b><u>AGENCIES</u></b>		
John Carr (Phone)	IDNR-DHPA	jcarr@dnr.in.gov
Sunni Carr	KDFWR	Sunni.Carr@ky.gov
Mike Compton	KSNPC	Mike.compton@ky.gov
Norma Condra	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Norma.c.condra@usace.army.mil
Doug Dawson	KDFWR	doug.dawson@ky.gov
Phil DeGarmo	USFWS-KY	phil_degarmo@fws.gov
Stephanie Hayes (Phone)	KY DOW	stephanie.hayes@ky.gov
Denise Held for Mike Cox	Natural Resources Conservation Service - Indiana	mike.cox@in.usda.gov
Bill Huser	KY Heritage Council	William.huser@ky.gov
Samantha Kaiser (Phone)	KY DOW	water@ky.gov
Amanda Kincaid	Kentucky SHPO	Amanda.kincaid@ky.gov
Nicole Konkol	KY Heritage Council	Nicole.konkol@ky.gov
Virginia Laszewski (Phone)	USEPA Region 5	Laszewski.virginia@epa.gov
Robin McWilliams-Munson	USFWS-IN	Robin_McWilliams@fws.gov
William Novak (Phone)	KDNR	bill.novak@ky.gov
Kim Penrod	Delaware Nation, OK	kpenrod@delawarenation.com
Evelyn Pickett	KSNPC	Evelyn.pickett@ky.gov
Jason Randolph	IDEM	jrandolp@IDEM.IN.gov
Seyed Shokouhzadeh	Evansville MPO	sshokouhzadeh@evansvillempo.com
Deb Snyder	US Army Corps of Engineers	Deborah.d.snyder@usace.army.mil
Wade Tharp (Phone)	IDNR-DHPA	wtharp1@dnr.in.gov
Todd Thompson	IN Geological Survey	tthomps@indiana.edu
Dave Williams	KY Geological Survey	Williams@uky.edu

## I-69 IAC Meeting No. 2 Summary – July 20, 2017

---

Name	Organization	Email
<b><u>PROJECT TEAM</u></b>		
Sandra Bowman	INDOT	sbowman@indot.IN.gov
Marshall Carrier	KYTC	Marshall.Carrier@ky.gov
Luke Eggering	Parsons	Luke.eggering@parsons.com
Tim Foreman	KYTC-DEA	Tim.Foreman@ky.gov
Cory Grayburn	Parsons	Cory.grayburn@parsons.com
Diane Hoeting	Parsons	Diane.Hoeting@parsons.com
Janelle Lemon	INDOT	jlemon@indot.in.gov
Kevin McClearn	AEI	kmcclearn@aei.cc
Brian Aldridge	Stantec	Brian.Aldridge@stantec.com
Michelle Allen	FHWA-IN	Michelle.allen@dot.gov
Steve Nicaise	Parsons	Steven.Nicaise@parsons.com
Mindy Peterson	C2 Communications	mindy@c2strategic.com
Juliet Port	Parsons	Juliet.port@parsons.com
Lindsey Postaski	Parsons	lindsey.postaski@parsons.com
Jim Poturalski (Phone)	INDOT	jpoturalski@indot.IN.gov
Dan Prevost	Parsons	Daniel.Prevost@parsons.com
Eric Rothermel	FHWA-KY	Eric.rothermel@dot.gov
Amber Schaudt	TSW Design Group	aschautd@tswdesigngroup.com
Ken Sperry	HMB	ksperry@hmbpe.com
Duane Thomas	FHWA-KY	Duane.thomas@dot.gov
Gary Valentine	KYTC	gvalentine@ky.gov
David Waldner (Phone)	KYTC	David.Waldner@ky.gov

## SUMMARY

1) Welcome and introductions – Dan Prevost, Parsons Environmental Lead for the I-69 Ohio River Crossing (ORX) project, opened the meeting and welcomed IAC participants.

- Housekeeping.
- Introductions around room; on phone. Dan explained the make-up of the project team and opened the room to introductions. He briefly ran through the agenda.

2) IAC Meeting #1 Recap

- Draft Purpose and Need – Parsons ran through the I-69 ORX project purpose and need.
  - Need – Lack of National I69 Corridor system linkage; high cost of maintaining cross river mobility on existing facilities; unacceptable levels of service for cross-river traffic; and high-crash locations in the I-69/US 41 corridor.
  - Purpose – Provide cross-river system linkage and connectivity between I-69 in Indiana and I-69 in Kentucky; develop a solution to address long-term cross-river mobility; provide a cross-river connection that reduces traffic congestion and delay; and improve safety for cross-river traffic.
- Range of Alternatives – Parsons briefly illustrated the five (5) corridors and the No Build alternative that were assessed in project Screening: West Corridor 1, West Corridor 2, Central Corridor 1, Central Corridor 2 (the 2004 DEIS Preferred Alternative), and East Corridor.
- Comments – After IAC Meeting #1, minutes were prepared and distributed to IAC members. A meeting summary will also be prepared and distributed following this meeting.
  - Based on IAC input, there was general concurrence about the project's range of alternatives and purpose and need.
  - Comments received from four agencies: USEPA, USACE, IDNR-DHPA, and IDEM.

3) Additional Outreach Activities since IAC Meeting #1

- River Cities Advisory Committee (RCAC) meeting #1, April 13, 2017
  - 27 attendees – community and business leaders from across region
  - Introduced project, purpose and need, range of alternatives, and the role of the RCAC Committee.
  - Feedback – Most of the feedback was regarding the project process. Some members expressed interest in accelerating the process. There were also

suggestions for additional RCAC members. A summary is posted on the project website at [\[link\]](#).

- RCAC Meeting#2 yesterday – The Project Team will also post a summary of yesterday’s meeting on the project website.

**Question: USEPA Region 5 asked if RCAC member names are also on the project website?**

**Response: Parsons responded “yes,” the list of organizations in the RCAC are included on the project website in meeting summary for the the first RCAC meeting at [\[link\]](#).**

- Consulting Parties Meeting #1, May 16, 2017.
  - 13 attendees including ACHP; Indiana and Kentucky SHPO; Angel Mounds; owners of properties previously identified as being on, or eligible for, the National Register; and historic preservation groups.
  - Provided project introduction, purpose and need, range of alternatives, overview of Section 106 process, and APE approach.
  - Feedback – Schedule/process questions; information about potentially historic properties; concern for impacts to Angel Mounds related to the East Corridor; and likely eligibility of both existing US 41 bridges.
  - Next meeting – late Summer/Fall following completion of above-ground surveys.
- Open Houses – held April 18 and 20, 2017 in Henderson and Evansville.
  - Over 200 attendees.
  - Provided project introduction, purpose and need, range of alternatives, project process/schedule.
  - Feedback – Collected via surveys, map comments, email phone, and office visits. A summary of feedback on the handout provided at this meeting is provided in the Public Meeting Summary on the project website at [\[link\]](#).
  - Next open houses – July 31 and August 1, 2017 to present the I-69 ORX project screening results.
- RCAC EJ Subcommittee Meeting #1 – Encompasses Title VI and Executive Order to include disadvantaged and low-income populations.
  - 16 subcommittee members.
  - Provided project introduction, overview of EJ and Title VI, role of subcommittee.
  - Feedback
    - Recommendations for additional committee members and groups
    - Recommendation on where/when to hold meetings, and means of communication
    - Expressed top issues of concern

- RCAC EJ Subcommittee Meeting #2 – Held yesterday. The Project Team will post a summary of yesterday’s meeting on the project website.

#### 4) Screening Process

- Screening Approach
  - Develop screening criteria – Based on Purpose and Need and environmental resources
  - Conceptual engineering and cost factors of range of alternatives
  - Secondary source data collection
  - Windshield surveys
  - Evaluation and screening of corridor based on screening criteria
- Screening Criteria
  - Purpose and Need performance measures
    - Provide a roadway facility for SIU #4 that can be designated as I-69
    - Provide a cost effective and affordable plan for long-term cross-river mobility
    - Provide a river crossing for I-69 operating at a minimum level of service
    - Provide a river crossing that improves safety
  - Potential environmental impacts
  - Engineering/cost – includes construction cost [right-of-way (ROW) and life cycle operation]; and construction complexity
    - Construction cost (low-high range in dollars)
    - ROW cost (low/medium/high)
    - Lifecycle/operation and maintenance cost (low/medium/high)
    - Construction complexity ((low/medium/high)
- Screening Results – Parsons walked through a number of criteria and discussed screening results for each of the five study corridors, as summarized in the Screening Report. The Screening Report will be ready for issuance in a week or two. The report will have the screening matrix table, approach, results, and comparison of alternatives. The report will be shared with this group via email, and participants will have 30 days to review and provide comment.

**Question: USEPA Region 5 asked if the criteria and results are in the Screening Report?**

**Response: Parsons responded “yes,” and the report will be posted on the project website as well.**

**Question:** USEPA Region 5 asked if IAC members can get copies of the presentation ahead of the future IAC meetings (hard copies and electronic copies 1 week in advance of meeting)?

**Response:** Parsons responded that we will attempt to provide these documents ahead of the meeting in the future.

**Question:** USEPA Region 5 asked if agency letters are part of the summary from first meeting?

**Response:** Parsons affirmed that they are.

**Question:** KY Division of Water asked if the Project Team has researched doing work over Outstanding Resource Waters and if the project corridors are in this boundary? They stated that due to the historic presence of mussels in this area the Project Team will need to coordinate with USFWS and USACE.

**Response:** Parsons responded that we will be looking further into resource constraints including investigation of the presence of mussels in the Ohio River.

**Question:** IDEM asked if impacts are based on edge of right-of-way (ROW) to edge of ROW?

**Response:** Parsons responded that the Screening Report maps show wide “magic-marker”-drawn corridors. The Project Team collected data on 2,000 ft.-wide areas, but for assessing impacts some assumptions were made for individual corridor widths (they varied by terrain). Impacts were generally quantified in a 400-700-ft. swath, with the area narrower along the US 41 corridor. It is too early to define the construction limits – at this stage it is very conceptual.

- Parsons indicated that the USACE had commented that there is a potential wetland mitigation site on the Indiana side of the river. Impacts currently shown in the Screening Report reflect impacts to that property, but as we move forward the Project Team will look at ways to avoid this area to the extent possible.

**Question:** USEPA Region 5 asked whether the forested wetlands that will be impacted are part of mitigation site?

**Response:** Parsons responded “yes.”

**Question:** USEPA Region 5 asked how old are the mitigation sites?

**Response:** IDEM responded that the site was created prior to the 2004 DEIS and was expanded in 2004; it is still in the monitoring phase.

**Question:** USEPA Region 5 asked whether the 2004 DEIS corridors were going through this area.

**Response:** Parsons responded that the Preferred Alternative in the 2004 DEIS went through this area. More area has since been added to the site.

**Question:** USEPA Region 5 asked if the Screening Report will break out impacts between Indiana and Kentucky?

**Response:** Parsons responded “No.” The Project Team will coordinate with the States individually, but we’ve taken a holistic project area-wide look at these. If the States have desire for additional data the team can provide numbers.

- Additional items noted included:
  - Green River State Forest near Central corridors on the Kentucky side. Also a few Imperiled Bat Conservation Fund (IBCF) properties in forested areas.
  - The only potential Section 4(f) properties currently identified as directly impacted are the twin bridges on Western corridors.
  - No potentially-eligible archaeological sites; however, the team will further investigate this for the preferred alternative.
  - Angel Mounds – No corridors physically impact this property. Noise/ visual/ vibration impacts are a concern with the East Corridor.

**Question:** USEPA Region 5 asked if the Project Team has received any additional comment from Native American tribes and/or historic tribes in the area?

**Response:** Parsons responded “yes,” at the first IAC meeting there were a number of representative from tribes on the phone. In response to the Consulting Party meeting #1, we received two letters, one of which was specific to Angel Mounds. Another tribe indicated that they have no interest in the corridors currently under study.

- Farmland – East corridor and Central Corridor 2 have the highest impact to farmland.

- Numerous residential relocations would be associated with the West corridors and East Corridor.
- Several business relocations would result from the West corridors
- Environmental Justice – The project team is currently working to identify where EJ populations are located in the project area. To date we have focused on available census tract data. No EJ relocations have been identified in these tracts to date; however the team will be digging a lot deeper in the next phase, and will be talking with community groups face to face.

**Question:** USEPA Region 5 asked if the team has only looked at relocation impacts?

**Response:** Parsons responded “yes,” that has been the focus in the Screening; however in the next phase we will start talking about tolling. We will be studying traffic data and looking at associated impacts (i.e., distribution patterns; air and noise impacts, etc.).

- Community cohesion – Western corridors would involve construction of the I-69 highway through residential and commercial communities. Potential to affect how people function in their daily lives (i.e., access issues to schools/churches, a change in feeling in those communities, etc.).
- Noise – The team will perform quantitative modeling on noise sensitive receptors.
- Potential for UST/contaminated material sites along the Western corridors mainly.
- Engineering/cost factors – Construction /bridge demolition cost is a large component of this.

**Question:** The USACE asked whether the construction costs include any assumption for mitigation costs?

**Response:** Parsons responded that “no,” they do not at this time, but moving forward that could be a significant project cost and will be considered.

**Question:** IDEM asked about cost calculations at this stage. Do the costs reflect overpasses/bridges outside of major river crossings inside urban areas for the Western corridors?

**Response:** HMB responded “yes,” most will be at-grade except at cross-roads (i.e., Watson Lane).



- Corridor Evaluations – Parsons summarized the key points of the Screening for each corridor.
  - Corridors recommended for Further Evaluation in the DEIS: No Build, West Corridor 1, West Corridor 2, and Central Corridor 1
  - Tolling options will be evaluated
  - Options for closing one or both US 41 bridges will be evaluated for each alternative and possible access management options for the US 41 corridor.

## 5) Next Steps

- DEIS alternatives development and evaluation
  - Detailed field surveys and impact assessment
  - Preliminary design (i.e., 25%) of DEIS alternatives
  - Tolling options (traffic analysis will factor into this)
    - Toll the new I-69 bridge
    - Toll both the new I-69 bridge and existing US 41 bridges
    - Different tolling rates based on bridge location and vehicle class (e.g., trucks and cars)
    - Can existing bridges maintain truck traffic? Should truck traffic be diverted?
  - US 41 options
    - Keep both US 41 bridges open
    - Close one or both US 41 bridges
    - Improvements along US 41
  - DEIS preparation and identification of a Preferred Alternative
- Project schedule
  - Due date for Screening Report comments – September 2, 2017 (the report was distributed via email to the IAC committee on August 2, 2017)
  - Summer 2017 to Summer 2018
    - Preliminary engineering
    - Detailed field surveys
    - DEIS preparation
    - IAC meeting #3 – detailed project alternatives – Winter 2017/2018
  - Summer/Fall 2018
    - IAC meeting #4 – identification of a Preferred Alternative
    - DEIS publication/public hearing/45-day comment period
  - Winter 2019 to Fall 2019

- IAC meeting #5 – review of DEIS comments and mitigation measures - Summer/Fall 2019
- FEIS/ROD preparation
- FEIS/ROD publication – Fall 2019

6) Group Discussion

**Question:** USEPA Region 5 asked why we are asking the agencies to review the Screening Report?

**Response:** FHWA responded that the Project Team seeks agency input on whether they have any concerns or issues regarding environmental resources for any of the corridors? Also seeking input on which corridor they prefer? Did we miss any resource? Commenting on the Screening Report provides another touch point with the agencies.

**Question:** One participant asked if this project will become a design/build project once we have a ROD?

**Response:** Parsons responded that we don't know yet. All options for project delivery are on the table. The States will have more information as we move forward and will make a decision at a later date.

**Question:** USEPA Region 5 asked if the Screening Report is a draft report?

**Response:** Parsons responded that it will be a final report. Any substantive comments are received will be addressed in the DEIS.

**Question:** USEPA Region 5 asked if the IAC participants will be receiving minutes from this meeting, and if so, when? They stated that it would be helpful to have the meeting minutes out ahead of the Screening Report so that they are available during the full duration of their review of the Screening Report.

**Response:** Parsons responded that minutes will be provided in about 3 weeks.

7) Meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.