

Monroe County SR 37 Corridor Plan Meeting Notes

Date: Monday, March 30, 2009 @ 10:00 a.m.

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

Attendees: Gregg Zody, Bill Williams, Mark Stoops, Richard Martin, Kevin Enright, John Irvin, Tom (?)
public attendee

EGT: Scott Burgins & Erin Shane SDG; Cory Whitesell & Lisa Dunaway, HWC

Cory provided INDOT updates to the committee. Section 1 and 2 EIS's were recently released. They do not include language about noise barriers but they do have wildlife corridors. The EIS's do not talk a lot about stormwater or tree replacement. The committee noted that if INDOT followed the county's code for stormwater for roads, they would be in a good position.

The committee noted that INDOT has already purchased tracts for tree preservation – their justification was mitigation for tree removal. Scott noted that the addition of Ravinia Woods is the mitigation area in Morgan County. It was agreed to determine if there were any mitigation areas areas in Monroe County.

Cory introduced the draft “basis of planning” report and went over key points. The idea of the plan is to determine what the county can do with their ordinances, what the county can request of INDOT in the ROW, and what the county wants INDOT to do above / beyond their norm. The committee agreed with the direction of the report and that the overview covered appropriate topics for the plan.

The committee discussed whether INDOT has to provide a written response regarding our adopted policy. The committee questioned if there any cases that defines review of communities – and whether INDOT needs to provide response.

The committee noted that there is a SPEA and county planning impervious coverage study that was just completed. The study noted that there are some areas that are at 0% developable. The committee also referenced a Bean Blossom water shed plan Heck (SP?) did for IDEM. Both docs could be relevant in determining what revisions are needed in codes.

The committee questioned how transport of hazardous materials over roads will this be handled and whether haz mat traps, especially in karst areas, are addressed.

The committee discussed the deadline for the project and when it would be complete. There were questions of how long the county had to prepare and submit the report to ensure that it would be considered as part of the EIS. The EGT is still targeting June 2009 to have a draft prepared.

Scott read through the development principles and the following revisions were suggested:

- Reword construction of I-69. Add INDOT and feds to statement, then follow up w/ community opposition at end; add elected community leaders; to say widespread concern might be negative b/c there are people supporting it; controversy instead of opposition
- Ag / greenspace – extensive instead of significant; forest instead of greenspace; instead of ED say has both community enhancing value; don't want poles b/t ED and quality of life
- ED – take out ED and put comm. dev or sustainable comm. dev; reword title to Sustainable ED;; directing sustainable development; select locations should be preserved for high quality development and others should be protected in their current state per our corridor plan; the first statement ID's SR 37 as a prime ED asset is not great- b/c INDOT could say I69 will be even larger asset
- add items that county is pleased with: wildlife corridors; adjacent land acquisition; hazardous waste; karst topography
- Cut housing and manufacturing and industrial? We'll see after re-word directing development?
- In manufacturing– county welcomes high quality dev that mirrors existing and planning improvements
- Cut housing? Even though it will be the predominant use along the new terrain? Yes – cut
- Transportation – add development principle; maintaining transportation network – frontage roads be built using INDOT money, not ours. Core of Monroe county planning is to target land that are vulnerable and lands that are resilient; no net loss of our tax base – want to ensure this happens when build frontage roads; utilizing or upgrades – insert; add verbiage about natural barriers for roads and INDOT's plans for construction will ... preserve linkages

The committee discussed how traffic will be managed when interstate is closed / constructed and how will this occur. The committee noted that INDOT will only use SR roads; so locally the county will need to figure out what roads will be used since no one will use the SR bypass.

The committee then discussed the new terrain impact study per the basis of planning document. The committee discussed the threshold for noise that INDOT uses, encouraging INDOT to use vegetation buffering requirements, and relating noise levels w/ landscaping requirements (for example more noisy roads need more vegetative buffering). The committee noted that if INDOT would not do noise impacts then maybe the county need a larger corridor setback.

The committee also discussed:

- Lighting / illumination
- Karst impacts – add interstates to ordinances
- INDOT Karst memorandum of understanding
- If the county does reservoir overlay – should have causeway – can put dirt in the valley?
- Air quality concerns? Not addressed here. Lisa will look for European regulations for examples
- Swimmable / fishable water levels must be maintained – need to address

- For connectivity – we have an existing connectivity issues
- need to show fiscal constraint – no funds to build

The committee agreed to continue discussion of the basis for planning document over email. Scott passed out a list of focus group invitee's for the committee to review. He noted that the focus group should be conducted after a complete review of the basis for planning doc. The input gathered this far for the project is heavily weighted pro at this point – the focus group will need to contain more public general input.

Next meeting will be April 13th at 10 am.