



# MID-STATES CORRIDOR

**Date of Meeting:** February 18, 2020  
**Re:** Mid-States Corridor Public Information Meeting Screening of Alternatives -- Loogootee, IN

**Location:** Loogootee High School – Loogootee, IN  
**Issue Date:** March 6, 2020

**Submitted By:** Lochmueller Group

**In Attendance:** There were approximately 500 attendees from the public in attendance. Additionally, approximately 20 representatives from the project team and/or INDOT/FHWA were in attendance.

**Key Themes of public input—these themes represent reoccurring sentiments from conversations with the project team and comment forms received at Loogootee, IN.**

1. Improving regional connectivity through a more direct route to promote economic development in the Loogootee/Martin County area is a significant need.
2. Environmental impacts, particularly to the Hoosier National Forest to the east and other natural resources are a significant issue.
3. Concerns with impacts to the people, property and way of life in the Loogootee area.
4. The project should use existing infrastructure where possible, and minimize new terrain construction.
5. Amish community could be significantly impacted and the farming community as well.



6200 Vogel Road  
Evansville, Indiana 47715

PHONE: 812.479.6200 • TOLL FREE: 800.423.7411

April 3, 2020

Page 2

A full meeting agenda and summary for all three public kick-off meetings can be found on the subsequent pages, following the location specific information.

**Date of Meeting:** February 19, 2020      **Re:** Mid-States Corridor Public Information Meeting Screening of Alternatives – Bedford, IN

**Location:** Bedford Middle School – Bedford, IN      **Issue Date:** March 6, 2020

**Submitted By:** Lochmueller Group

**In Attendance:** There were approximately 150 attendees from the public in attendance. Additionally, approximately 15 representatives from the project team and/or INDOT/FHWA were in attendance.

**Key Themes of public input—these themes represent reoccurring sentiments from conversations with the project team and comment forms received at Bedford, IN.**

1. Missed the opportunity to fully capitalize on I-69... don't want to miss this opportunity
2. Environmental impacts, particularly those which affect the region's karst topography (water quality), and Hoosier National Forest should be minimized or avoided.
3. Route M has extremely challenging terrain and multiple concerns expressed about impacts to the limited access that already exists, and even additional flooding concerns.
4. Potential impacts to private property (including homes, and farms, especially with route M) are important.
5. Will additional traffic on this facility cause safety and congestion issues on SR 37/US 231.

April 3, 2020

Page 3

A full meeting agenda and summary for all three public kick-off meetings can be found on the subsequent pages, following the location specific information.

**Date of Meeting:** February 20, 2020      **Re:** Mid-States Corridor Public Information Meeting Screening of Alternatives – Jasper, IN

**Location:** Jasper Middle School – Jasper, IN      **Issue Date:** March 6, 2020

**Submitted By:** Lochmueller Group

**In Attendance:** There were approximately 600 attendees from the public in attendance. Additionally, approximately 20 representatives from the project team and/or INDOT/FHWA were in attendance.

**Key Themes of public input—these themes represent reoccurring sentiments from conversations with the project team and comment forms received at Jasper, IN.**

1. Impacts to private property, particularly farms and residential areas, are important.
2. Concerns that new roadway will adversely impact the counties biggest growth area around Ireland.
3. Upgrades to existing state highways that will be used for access to a new facility will be needed.
4. Concerns with impacts to business if you bypass Huntingburg and Jasper .
5. Improving regional connectivity is vital for continued economic development and improved quality of life in Huntingburg, Jasper and Dubois County.
6. Spend money to fix existing facilities rather than build a new facility.

A full meeting agenda and summary for all three public kick-off meetings can be found on the following pages.

## **Public Meeting Agenda**

### **ITEMS DISCUSSED:**

The meetings were an open house format lasting from 5:30 – 7:00 pm Eastern Time. A brief project presentation was given at 6:00 pm (approximately 30 minutes). Before and after the presentation, the project team was available for questions at informational stations.

The meetings provided an overview of the Mid-States Corridor project, outcomes from the screening of alternatives effort, and next steps. The presentation included a description of the screening process including factors considered, facility types and the preliminary alternatives moving forward for more detailed study. A questionnaire (online and hard copies) was available to gather feedback from attendees (March 23<sup>rd</sup> deadline).

#### Project Stations

After attendees signed in at a welcome table and provided contact information for future outreach, they were encouraged to visit the stations to learn more about the project.

#### **Public Involvement Station**

At the public involvement station, attendees were given an informational handout with project details, a timeline, information about the screening process and a map of the alternatives carried forward for detailed studies. The handout also included contact information to encourage attendees to follow the project progress through the website or social media outlets. In addition to a take-home handout, the attendees were given a questionnaire and encouraged to complete the form on-line (QR Code was provided on forms and at the meeting), which included an opportunity to provide a route preference, additional input on potential impacts along with general comments.

#### **Project Overview Station**

The project overview station included posters with the 12-county study area map and a brief explanation of the Mid-States Corridor. The project representatives answered general project questions.

#### **Screening Process Station**

The screening process station included graphics to help explain the screening process. The project representatives answered questions relating to the process including the alternatives family approach as well as other general project questions.

April 3, 2020

Page 5

### **Facility Type Station**

The facility type station included a poster with a brief description and images of the three facility types under consideration: Super-2, Expressway, and Freeway. The project representative answered questions about the types of facilities considered and what factors drive that decision.

### **Alternatives Moving Forward (Mapping) Station**

The alternatives moving forward station contained mapping of each of the five routes (ten alternatives) carried forward for detailed studies. Knowing this station would draw the most attention, multiple project representatives manned two sets of six maps showing the routes. Questions at this station covered a range of interests and concerns, mostly focused on potentially impacted properties or proximity of routes to people's homes/properties. They also explained the process that narrowed the number of potential routes down to where they are today, what the 2,000' corridor lines meant, and where the process goes from here. The Tier 1 process determines the route and facility type or No Build. If a build decision is identified, the selected alternative corridor will then advance to subsequent Tier 2 studies, where specific alignments will be determined.

### **Next Steps Station**

The next steps station included a graphic of the remaining project milestones. The project representative explained the 'next steps' of the Tier 1 process, what takes place after this phase of the project process, and fielded general project questions.

### Presentation

Project Manager, Jason DuPont (Lochmueller Group), began the presentation with introductions of the project team, including Kyanna Moon (INDOT), Michelle Allen (Federal Highway), Mark Schroeder (Regional Development Authority), and David Goffinet (Lochmueller, Public Involvement). The presentation included:

- Project Milestone Schedule – Where are we? - four project milestones: potential alternatives and Purpose & Need, Screening of Alternatives, Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and Final EIS/Record of Decision
- Preliminary Alternatives – How did we get from dozens to 10 routes and 28 alternatives?
- Alternatives Families Approach – three geographic families of alternatives, screen by families based on costs, benefits, and impacts

April 3, 2020

Page 6

- Northwest, North Central, Northeast families - show each alternative considered within each family
- Three Facility Types – show examples of Super-2, expressway and freeway
- Screening Process – performance in meeting purpose and need, potential impacts to human and natural environment, and comparative costs
- Alternatives Carried Forward for Detailed Study – by family describe which alternatives carried forward and why, also explain why alternatives were NOT carried forward

David Goffinet, Public Involvement Manager (Lochmueller Group), explained the next steps of the process and the importance of public involvement throughout, including:

- The next steps for public and agency involvement, including future public meeting dates
  - Agency Coordination meeting and tour
  - Public hearings: Fall 2020
- The variety of groups involved and subsequent meetings, involving: Regional Issues Involvement Teams, *Ad Hoc* stakeholder meetings, working alignment meetings, and the broader public.
- Outreach Tools – The various ways the public can provide feedback, comments, or questions, including: the project website, the local project office on Vincennes University Jasper Campus Administration Building, the comment sheets provided, and various project social media outlets.
- Encourage people to complete project questionnaires.

The project team remained at the venue after the presentation to answer questions.