



**Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes  
June 24, 2009 McCloskey Conference Room 135, City Hall**

*Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Minutes are transcribed in a summarized outline manner. Audio recordings from the meeting are available in the Planning Department for reference.*

***Attendance***

Citizens Advisory Committee (Voting Members): Chair Jack Baker (McDoel Gardens NA), Sarah Ryterband (Prospect Hill NA), Natalie Wrubel (League of Women Voters), Ted Miller (citizen), Elizabeth Cox-Ash (McDoel Gardens NA), Buff Brown (B-TOP), Laurel Cornell (citizen), David Walter (6<sup>th</sup> & Ritter NA), and Joanne Henriot (Bryan Park NA).

Others In Attendance (including Non-Voting CAC Members): Randy Paul (citizen), Jay Mitchell (INDOT), David Butts (INDOT), Mary Jo Hamman (Michael Baker Group), Christine Carver (B-TOP), Greg Alexander (B-TOP), Jelene Campbell (Green Acres NA), Jessie Rome (citizen), Jen Naylor (citizen), Shawn Naylor (citizen), Jane Spearman (Green Acres NA), Scott Robinson (BMC MCO Staff), and Raymond Hess (BMC MPO Staff).

**I. Call to Order (~6:35 PM)**

**II. Approval of Minutes** - The minutes from the May 27, 2009 meeting were accepted by the CAC with one correction.

**III. Communications from the Chair** - Mr. Baker had no reports.

**IV. Reports from the Officers and/or Committees** – There were no reports.

**V. Reports from the MPO Staff**

**A. Ball State Student Study** - Mr. Hess indicated that there is no news related to this since he has been unable to get a hold of Mr. Scott Truex from Ball State University.

**B. Long Range Vision Statement/Project Prioritization Discussion** - Mr. Robinson reminded the Committee of their ‘homework’ to assign values to the working outline in an effort to begin the process of developing a scoring system. Ms. Wrubel objected to the idea of project prioritization and felt the values were arbitrary and would not guide project selection. Mr. Baker encouraged the Committee to continue with these efforts and bring their thoughts to the next meeting.

**VI. Old Business**

**A. FY 2009-2010 Unified Planning Work Program Amendment** – Mr. Desmond explained that the MPO adopts a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) in order to demonstrate how federal and local funds will be spent by the MPO. An amendment to the UPWP is warranted in order to add the FY2010 funding. Additionally, new tasks were added to some of the UPWP elements. These changes include tasks related to 2010 Census coordination, Americans with Disabilities Act transition plans, quarterly project reports, Transportation Enhancement funding administration, a transit feasibility study, and start-up of a car-sharing program. The concept of car-sharing was explained and discussed at length. Sarah Ryterband made a motion to recommend approval of the

UPWP as presented to the Policy Committee. Elizabeth Cox-Ash seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**B. FY 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program** - Mr. Hess reviewed the draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He noted that the Complete Streets Policy was applied in its development, but only to new projects. Mr. Hess reviewed the differences between the FY2009-2012 TIP and the new FY2010-2013 TIP. He noted which projects seek compliance with the Complete Streets Policy and highlighted changes to projects as proposed by Indiana Department of Transportation, Monroe County, City of Bloomington, Town of Ellettsville, Community School Corporations, Rural Transit, Bloomington Transit, and Indiana University Transit. He also noted an email from Ms. Ryterband requesting that INDOT's SR45/46 Bypass project be postponed from FY2010 to FY2011 so that the impacts of the project to the community can be properly assessed and possibly mitigated. Mr. Hess clarified that the CAC is requested to take two actions: 1. Make a recommendation as to whether applicable projects are Complete Streets Compliant; and 2. Make a recommendation on adoption of the TIP.

Ms. Ryterband stated she was happy to see that the Complete Streets Policy was followed. She motioned that the six projects (Fullerton Pike, Mt. Tabor Rd. Bridge, 17<sup>th</sup>/Arlington roundabout, Old 37 and Dunn intersection, Sare/Rogers Roundabout, and Tapp/Rockport Roundabout) are compliant with the Complete Streets Policy. Ms. Cox-Ash seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Ryterband then motioned to change the construction year for the SR45/46 bypass project from 2010 to 2011. She said that the community has changed significantly since the project was first conceptualized. Ms. Cornell seconded the motion. Mr. Walter checked the INDOT website which stated that the project is scheduled to be let July 15<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Mitchell doubted that the project would be let by this date. Julie Campbell and other residents of the Green Acres Neighborhood expressed concern about the project's impact to their neighborhood. The project will take down trees but does not include a sound barrier. Crossing the bypass by foot or by bike is difficult now and expanding the bypass will only make it deadlier. Christine Carver suggested people need to get out of their cars in order to curb the obesity problem – the bypass only exacerbates this problem. Jen Naylor asked why the pedestrian overpass was removed from the TIP. Mr. Hess explained that the State, the University, and the City could not come to an agreement on how to implement it. Ms. Naylor stated that this only compounds the issue and Mr. Naylor indicated he had been hit trying to cross the Bypass at the Polly Grimshaw Trail. Mr. Brown asked Mr. Mitchell the implications of delaying the project. Mr. Mitchell replied that ultimately the decision to delay the project rests with the Policy Committee. However, from INDOT's perspective, projects need to be delivered on time and on budget and a delay may have an adverse effect. Additionally, a drastic change to the project may cause an inconsistency between the MPO's TIP and the State's TIP (STIP). Mr. Brown suggested that the area needs to be restudied since most of the travel is local and not intercity. Mr. Baker asked if INDOT would consider any of these concerns if the project was delayed a year. Mr. Mitchell said he was not in a position to say. Mr. Mitchell stated that some of the details about the project could be learned at the public

information meeting on July 9<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Paul asked what the Policy Committee felt about the project. Mr. Baker said he was unable to speak to that specifically but has heard a lot of discontent about the project. Ms. Ryterband called for the question and to end discussion. Mr. Walter seconded and the motion passed unanimously. Mr. Baker then called for the vote on Ms. Ryterband's original motion to change the construction of the Bypass from 2010 to 2011. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Cox-Ash motioned to extend the meeting until 8:30pm. Mr. Walter seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Ryterband then made a motion to accept the TIP as changed. Mr. Walter seconded. In response to a question from Mr. Brown, Mr. Hess clarified the funding for the Jackson Creek Trail and the Cascades Trail. Mr. Robinson further explained that the City conducted a feasibility study on the Cascades trail. The motion passed unanimously.

**C. I-69 Hardship Right-of-Way Acquisition (INDOT)** - Mr. Desmond explained that INDOT wishes to acquire a property at the southwest corner of State Road 37 and Tapp Road. All proposed configurations of the future I-69 project show significant impact to this property. Therefore, the property owner has been unable to sell it and has petitioned INDOT to purchase it from her through their hardship acquisition process. This proposal was considered and turned down by the Policy Committee earlier this year. INDOT found a Code of Federal Regulation citation which states that regionally significant projects must be in the MPO's TIP despite the funding source. INDOT would like the MPO to reconsider this request. Additionally, the I-69 project is in the Long Range Transportation Plan and actions of the MPO should not contradict this document. Also, FHWA views this project as a stand-alone project and not an outright endorsement of future aspects of I-69. Mr. Desmond also explained the possible ramifications if the project was denied and there was an inconsistency with the TIP and STIP: 1) the MPO's TIP could be frozen until it is brought back into compliance; 2) INDOT could withhold the MPO's suballocation of Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding; 3) INDOT could terminate the agreement that established the MPO; or 4) INDOT could do nothing. Mr. Desmond indicated that there is no indication which option INDOT would exercise. Mr. Butts answered a question from a previous meeting by stating that the property owner does not need to reside on the property to qualify for a hardship acquisition.

Ms. Cox-Ash stated she will vote for this amendment because she understands that the property owner is unable to sell their biggest asset. She also stated she is against I-69 and how INDOT has handled this project and public input. Ms. Ryterband asked why this project is considered regionally significant. Mr. Mitchell explained it refers to projects that require federal action and that this project and I-69 as a whole meet this definition. Mr. Butts said that regionally significant refers to the amount of traffic that the highway carries or will carry. Ms. Ryterband asked if the project is fiscally constrained. Mr. Mitchell stated that the acquisition of this property is fiscally constrained. He also explained that the State is committed to build I-69 and that the section through this area will use innovative financing. There is a reasonable expectation that this funding will be available for purposes of the State's Long Range Transportation Plan.



Ms. Henriot motioned to extend the meeting until 9pm. Ms. Cox-Ash seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Mitchell continued that the burden of proof for funding will come after the environmental impact statement is complete. Ms. Wrubel asked if the MPO ever received a letter from FHWA. Mr. Desmond indicated that FHWA had the phone conversation with MPO staff instead of sending a letter. Ms. Ryterband expressed sympathy for the property owner but reservations about the I-69 project and its impact to this community and others. She has concerns about the environment and INDOT's route selection for I-69. For these reasons, she will be voting no on this amendment. Mr. Baker asked if INDOT is compelled to buy the property if it meets the hardship criteria. Mr. Butts and Mr. Mitchell replied that INDOT must pursue the action to purchase the property if the hardship acquisition criteria have been met. Ms. Henriot asked how INDOT arrived at the purchase price. Mr. Butts explained that it is a rough estimate. Mr. Butts also explained that INDOT turns down the vast majority of hardship acquisition requests that it receives. Mr. Baker asked if other pots of funding could be used to acquire this property. Ms. Hamman indicated that it would still have to be reflected in the TIP regardless of the source of funding. Mr. Alexander asked if the Policy Committee could remove I-69 from the Long Range Plan. Mr. Baker stated that I-69 had to be included in the Long Range Plan but that there is stated opposition to the project in the document. Mr. Miller stated that if this project is not meant to be construed as an endorsement of I-69, he is hard-pressed to vote against it knowing the hardship that the property owner is under. Ms. Henriot felt there was little room to deny this project if the consequences to the City and other projects would be negative. Ms. Cox-Ash moved to approve the hardship acquisition and Ms. Henriot seconded. The motion passed by a roll-call vote of 5-2-1-1 (Yes – Walter, Miller, Henriot, Cox-Ash, Baker; No – Wrubel, Ryterband; Abstain – Cornell; Recuse – Brown).

**VII. New Business** – There was no new business

**VIII. Communications from Committee Members**

**A. Topic Suggestions for future agendas** – no suggestions.

**IX. Upcoming Meetings**

**A.** Policy Committee – June 26, 2009 at 1:30pm (Council Chambers)

**B.** Summer Recess – July 2009

**C.** Technical Advisory Committee – August 26, 2009 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)

**D.** Citizens Advisory Committee – August 26, 2009 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)

**Adjournment** (~8:30 PM)

*These minutes were approved by the CAC at their regular meeting held on August 26, 2009.  
(staff initials: SFR 8/26/2009)*