

# Monroe County SR 37 Corridor Plan Meeting Notes

**Date:** Monday, January 26, 2009 @ 10:00am.

**Location:** Monroe County Courthouse, Nat U. Hill Meeting Room

**Facilitator:** Scott Burgins & Erin Shane, SDG and Cory Whitesell, HWC

**Attendees:** Gregg Zody, Bill Williams, Mark Stoops (arrived 10:28 a.m.), Richard Martin (arrived 11:14 a.m.)  
EGT: Scott Burgins & Erin Shane SDG; Cory Whitesell & Lisa Dunaway, HWC

Scott opened the meeting with an explanation of the corridor plan and how the process will work and its schedule. There will be approximately 4 meetings for this project. The plan will essentially be a gap analysis to identify where the County needs to address code or policy.

Cory noted that the Section 4 Tier 2 environmental won't be done for another year. Section 4 is all new terrain - SR 37 south to county line. Section 5, through Bloomington, is farther out from that. INDOT won't make or confirm section 5 routes until after Tier 2 environmental assessment is released.

Scott noted that a group of stakeholders – 10-15 people – needs to be identified to interview for the project. These same people should serve as an informal steering committee. Scott will send preliminary list of steering committee members out and Greg and Bill can refine.

Mark asked if this doc will feed into I69 planning at INDOT. Cory confirmed that is the county has anything approved by resolution or ordinance; INDOT has to analyze as part of their Tier 2 environmental studies.

The group followed with a number of concerns about the plan and the project:

- Will this document feed into I-69 planning – the answer is yes
- Karst Preservation and steep slope in Monroe County
- Will other firms be assisting the Economic Growth Team? - No
- What options are there for protecting wildlife and reducing noise pollution?
  - the I-69 alternative transportation corridor study gives recommendations for underpasses and overpasses

The following points were discussed during the ensuing meeting:

- Neither the group nor the county wishes for many truck stops – especially around BIO area
- Scott noted that Morgan County doesn't want truck stops either –so that means no one can get gas in Morgan / Monroe? Need to think about this

- County wants development to go to small rural towns – county wants to control what happens at the off ramps and want the area to stay rural, the same way it is now
- Bike and pedestrian traffic – need to include accommodations for to ensure possible funding in the future.
- Question: What do you want this to be? What is your ideal outcome?
  - Environment Constraints need to be highlighted
  - Karst terrain needs to be considered
- INDOT/DLZ has been unwilling to share info for Tier 2
- DLZ – INDOT has been unwilling to share info for Tier 2 – we can get info for Tier 1
- Mark suggested that the commissioners officially request the Tier 2 studies that have been done thus far
- Development may occur in Greene County at interchange as they have no P&Z; development can avoid Monroe and go there. This development will have ripple effects
- CR 45 is a long range plan – it is open to multi lane for future land use plan – but if we can get connector to I69 – we can eliminate need for multi use lane on 45.
- How does this affect MPO? – Check with Julie Thomas

The group then discussed the entire corridor through Monroe County, starting with the north end:

- Bifurcation as part of the plan through the forest
- 1st interchange at Chambers – pretty much done deal – county is OK with that
- Creek crossings
- Greenways plan comes in under transmission lines
  - There was a 72 lot plan here
- Why the need for the Chambers interchange?
  - Public safety
  - So we can do restrictive land use here
- Who does frontage roads? Anything on INDOT maps – they do. On these maps I've added INDOT supplied maps. They have trimmed down a lot of frontage roads
- So now down to Sample Interchange
  - Will shift road
- Walnut / Kinser Pike – issue with what interchange to use? City wants Kinser - County wants Walnut
  - Issue Walnut and north 37 – floodplain
  - Old iron bridge – wants to continue to use so doesn't get out of maintenance
  - Kinser gives you more opportunity to develop there
  - Whichever one does not get the interchange- will get a grade separation
  - If use walnut can connect to bottom something road
  - Impact on historic district - less of an impact with the Walnut interchange
  - There are challenges w/ both – but county favors Walnut
  - There is an agreement that the City will sewer for residential near Kinser

- There is a business park a bit south on Acuff road
- There is nothing in the long range plan that deals with Kinser Park – if we do this it will go thru a lot of residential
- All the vacant land will go to residential if used
- Should we work out a solution with city and offer back to INDOT?
- Acuff, north Kinser, stoplight, 48 – will lose these as pass thru's
- 45 or Tapp Road – city and county are in disagreement here
  - INDOT is proposing overpass at Tapp with interchange at 45
  - Addition of connector at city / county expense
  - Expansion of medical park to creek – then no build area
  - Connection road has issues due to slopes, etc
  - Extension of road
- Interchange at Old 37
  - Environmentally constraint free – want to keep eye on
  - Want to widen view at this point b/c of access roads, chances for development, etc
- Everything south of this is an underpass or an overpass – until county line
- Viewshed will be very important on new terrain – will need to protect
- No direct development from interchange, but may have pressures from other
- Grade separations on:
  - Bolyn
  - Tram way
  - Launch
  - No grade separation at mount Zion
  - Harmony
  - Evans lane
  - 2 others?
- Then at end the interchanges would be in Greene County
- Define I-69 corridor boundary – now it is a 1.5 mile from center line. It will grow to accommodate special protections –want to tie to geography for the most part
- What about 37 that gets orphaned. What has INDOT said about traffic impact on now I-37?
- Noise and light pollution.
- Environmental impacts of development near the BIO, near Old 37.
- How much of the new terrain will be in ag zone? 15% slope analysis identified as restricted area for development. There are 63 sections of prime agricultural land in Monroe – per county extension - we don't want to develop that.
- Mass transit idea in the I-69 plan? This needs to be evaluated for this and to include Bloomington

The group then discussed the project timeframe – 5 to 6 months to get this plan done. It is important that the plan get to INDOT to ensure that it is included in the environmental assessment for Section 4.

The county may want to create interim corridor zones for wildlife issues, pedestrian issues – etc to be incorporated into the master plan. The County will need to address how to accommodate uses in the interim of I69.

Next meeting will be Monday, February 23<sup>rd</sup> at 10 a.m. at the County Building. *(Meeting time subsequently changed to 10:30 a.m.)*