



**I-69 Subcommittee Meeting Minutes**

**February 10, 2012 1:30pm**

**McCloskey Room (#135), City Hall, 401 N. Morton St., Bloomington, IN 47404**

*I-69 Subcommittee minutes are transcribed in a summarized outline manner. Meetings are not recorded.*

**I-69 Subcommittee:** Jack Baker (Bloomington Plan Commission), Richard Martin (Monroe County Plan Commission), Mark Stoops (Monroe County Commission), Bill Williams (Monroe County Highway Dept.), Dan Swafford (Ellettsville Town Council), Andy Ruff (Bloomington City Council), Mark Kruzan (Bloomington Mayor), Robert Tally (FHWA Indiana Division), Samuel Sarvis (INDOT).

**Others:** S. Wells, A. Reid, M. Allen, T. Tokarski, A. Smith, R. Westcott, D. Sabbagh, R. Spaw, P. Ash, V. McClary, J. Borrasso, M. McMath, S. Walls, D. Owens, and D. Goldblatt.

**MPO Staff:** Tom Micuda, Josh Desmond, and Raymond Hess.

Introduction of Sub-committee members and guests - The meeting opened at 1:35 PM.

Purpose of the sub-committee meeting – R. Martin gave a brief background report and identified the purpose of the meeting to update members on recent activities and discuss facilitation of Participating Agency opportunity for 3 LPA participants of BMCMPPO.

Review and approval of BMCMPPO I-69 Sub-committee minutes of January 13, 2012 meeting – R. Martin requested but did not receive any corrections to the minutes of the last meeting and declared unanimity for approval.

Report of Sub-committee activities since last Sub-committee meeting – R. Martin reviewed action items resulting from the last Sub-committee meeting on January 13, 2012, including the preparation of a 'wants list' in response to Mr. Starks question at the last Policy Committee meeting and on-going efforts to initiate the Participating Agency opportunity for local jurisdictions – the subject of this meeting.

Report of correspondence with INDOT and FHWA since last Sub-committee meeting – J. Baker reported on correspondence to get this meeting and offers for Participating Agency status for City of Bloomington and Monroe County governments.

Limited role of BMCMPPO as facilitator for request – R. Martin explained that the role of the BMCMPPO and its I-69 Sub-committee was to act as a facilitator of the Participating Agency opportunity. The BMCMPPO is not eligible to be a Participating agency.

Scope of Participating Agency actions in preparing Section 5 FEIS document – R. Tally stated that on February 6, 2012 a letter was sent to the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Town of Ellettsville, Morgan County and City of Martinsville inviting them to participate as Participating Agencies under the provisions of SAFETEALU. Mr. Tally stressed that the Participating Agency offer was not a requirement because the project pre-dates the enabling law. It is being offered to allow timely input and a formal response is expected by March 7. It is important for agencies to identify appropriate

representation of the agency interest. The 1<sup>st</sup> meeting is scheduled for Feb. 15, 2012. Participation will require an expeditious schedule and commitment to the schedule milestones. Section 5 is an existing facility and they expect real-time review of documents in preparation. It could be by chapter, section, etc. They expect a regular meeting schedule and participation. The Participating Agency does not provide a vote. It is an opportunity to provide input and participate in dialog. It does not indicate support for the project. They expect many concurrent reviews. He commends INDOT for taking this step.

S. Sarvis confirmed the letter and a positive response from Morgan County already. He expects this opportunity leads INDOT to a successful product with roles for the Participating Agencies. Appropriate representation with expertise and scope of knowledge are necessary. Traffic and planning are the focus with environmental and social issues examined. Sub-committee input is important in starting this process.

M. Kruzan asked if this initiative was more policy or technically oriented. R. Tally responded that the jurisdictions have special expertise. He considered this to be a loosely technical aspect of the EIS process but not a policy role per se. NEPA is an informed decision process. It adds a structural level of input beyond that which would otherwise occur. Each agency decides who their best representative is. M. Kruzan stated there was a big difference between 1 person and several perspectives. S. Sarvis stated it was not expected to be a policy meeting but also not engineers only. Not every entity will have the same capacity to participate. He expected different people from different disciplines to participate but did need a focal person to act as the primary contact. R. Tally noted that as the group convenes, it needs to set a structure and agenda. Maybe different people at particular meetings for various topics are appropriate. We will need to work this out together. R. Martin noted that INDOT does expect to have a primary contact. R. Tally added that they expect that person to be able to act on behalf of the agency.

M. Stoops asked if they could meet on Feb. 15<sup>th</sup> without commitment. M. Kruzan as a clarification stated yes. S. Sarvis said the process is on-going for Section 5 so the sooner you get involved, the sooner you get in on the planning. M. Stoop said he likes the sound of this and wished we had this opportunity for Section 4. It does provide more access to studies. S. Sarvis stated that in the sense that it helps set tasks and evaluation of information as it is brought forward, it provides more access. M/ Stoops asked what are the pitfalls?

R. Tally stated that this was a relatively new process but FHWA does have similar things elsewhere. It is not an 'agree or disagree' type activity. The purpose is to catch anything that is missing. We want to find an appropriate balance which requires local knowledge. Now we only get information through the public process of hearings and comments. The downside is participating and working in a timely manner. We want to make the best informed decisions possible. S. Sarvis added that the downside was the commitment requirement to meet timelines and provide timely information. J. Baker asked for an overview of meetings and schedule. S. Sarvis reported that the DEIS was planned for September, 2012 and the FEIS for March 2013. J. Baker asked if meeting would be weekly or monthly? S. Sarvis said they would meet on February 15 and then evaluate the process. He anticipated monthly gatherings but maybe more frequent if necessary to meet project schedules. R. Tally noted that the schedule was aggressive – April for alternative review and hoping to carry forward a preferred alternative into draft between now and September. There will be a flurry of activity. J Baker stated that he assumed a

Participating Agency would slip into an existing process and he is hearing that this is a new process. R. Tally explained that they are adapting the process to accommodate this new opportunity.

J. Baker asked who will ultimately make decisions. R. Tally responded that 'the buck stops here'. I sign the documents based upon input from my staff – INDOT and FHWA sign. Our effort is to meet as many expectations as possible. J. Baker asked if he had someone who would participate. R. Tally identified Michelle Allen as the 'always there' participant for FHWA and that he would attend when possible. R. Martin asked about INDOT participation. S. Sarvis identified S. Walls and S. Flum and himself as possible.

R. Martin asked about the relationship between Participating Agencies and contractor working for INDOT. S. Sarvis stated that contractor work effort is driven by necessity and discussion, and that the Participating Agency group will frame the issues to address. Contractor results can be reviewed and commented upon.

A. Ruff asked about Section 4 changes that are still occurring. Why not structure something for Section 4? R. Martin replied that the purpose of this meeting was to address the Section 5 Participating Agency opportunity for the EIS and the Section 4 issues would be a separate discussion. R. Tally stated that the Participating Agency opportunity is focused on Section 5.

M. Stoops noted that Road School was the 1<sup>st</sup> week of March. R. Tally concurred and stated the first full Participating Agency meeting would be after Road School.

R. Martin declared that one interest of the I-69 Sub-committee was to see to it that local Participating Agencies had the resources necessary to actually participate. R. Tally stated that the intent was to have meetings in the area and minimize expense for local jurisdictions. S. Walls noted that the invitations sent today placed the meeting in the local office. S. Sarvis stated that it may be necessary for Participating Agencies to host activities on occasion.

R. Martin reviewed meeting outcomes and requested information on other items for the 'needs list' to discuss with INDOT and FHWA. M. Stoops asked S. Sarvis for assistance with geotechnical reports for Section 4.

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 PM.

Minutes prepared by Richard Martin and Raymond Hess.