



Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
October 27, 2010 McCloskey Conference Room 135, City Hall

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

Attendance

Citizens Advisory Committee (Voting Members): Chair Patrick Murray (Prospect Hill NA), Joanne Henriot (Bryan Park NA), Bill Milroy (Old Northeast NA), Ted Miller (citizen), Jack Baker (McDoel Gardens NA), Paul Ash (McDoel Gardens NA), Elizabeth Cox-Ash (McDoel Gardens NA), and Larry Jacobs (Chamber of Commerce).

Others In Attendance (including Non-Voting CAC Members): Scott Robinson (BMCMPPO staff), Raymond Hess (BMCMPPO staff), and John Kehrberg (citizen), Sandra Flum (INDOT), Sam Sarvis (INDOT), Jim Ude (INDOT), Kathy Eaton-McKalip (INDOT), Mary Jo Hamman (Michael Baker Group), David Isley (Bernardin Lochmueller Associates), Eric Swickard (Bernardin Lochmueller Associates), Tom Molt (DLZ Consulting), Jay DuMontelle (Federal Highway Administration), and Michelle Allen (FHWA).

I. Call to Order and Introductions (~6:30 PM)

II. Approval of Minutes - The September 22, 2010 minutes were accepted.

III. Communications from the Chair – There were no communications.

IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees – ADA and Accessibility – Mr. Martin stated, the ADA and Accessibility subcommittee met on September 30th. The subcommittee is working on a universal design policy statement to be used as part of the Complete Streets Policy. The subcommittee is identifying other partners in this effort and how to educate the community and officials. The next meeting will be October 28th. Mr. Hess stated the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) supports the development of ADA transition plans. It was also stated at today’s TAC meeting that FHWA and INDOT may assist with the education component.

V. Reports from MPO Staff

A. Project Tracking – Mr. Hess explained the MPO requires a quarterly progress report for all construction projects identified in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to ensure the projects stay on schedule up to letting. The information received from local public agencies is condensed and is provided in the packet. Mr. Hess spoke with CAC member Barbara Salisbury earlier and she suggested that language be added to the progress report related to accessibility features of projects.

In the interest of addressing action items, Mr. Baker moved that New Business be discussed before Old Business. Mr. Jacobs seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

VII. New Business

A. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment: Segment of I-69 Section 4 - Mr. Hess explained the CAC considered an amendment to include I-69 in the TIP in August. INDOT has requested a change to how they wish the project to be reflected in

the TIP: only a <2 mile segment instead of the entire Section 4 project. Since this is a significant change to the project, the MPO reinitiated the public comment period and is seeking recommendations from the Committees before the Policy Committee votes on the issue in November. There is no change to the project, just how it is shown in the TIP.

Mr. Miller asked FHWA representatives why the MPO needs to approve State projects. Mr. DuMontelle replied that citizens should be made aware of projects to be implemented in their locality. Projects on the National Highway System are selected by the State but still may impact a local community. For this reason, federal laws require all federally funded transportation projects within a planning area to be reflected in the TIP. Mr. Miller asked if the project could be stopped if the MPO denied inclusion of the project in the TIP. Mr. DuMontelle replied the project must be included in the TIP in order to advance and before FHWA will sign off on the environmental document. He also stated the project is in the Long Range Transportation Plan. FWHA hopes to see a collaborative and cooperative process related to this project. It is in the best interest of the MPO and INDOT to find a solution. Mr. Miller recalled how denial of a TIP amendment last year almost resulted in the MPO losing all of its funding from INDOT. Mr. Miller suggested the process puts the MPO in a position it does not want to be in. Mr. DuMontelle suggested there is an opportunity for the Committees to better understand the process while at the same time influencing the project to meet the community's needs. Mr. Miller stated there is no opportunity to influence the project because insufficient details about projects are provided at the time of consideration. Ms. Allen stated that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process provides the opportunity to make suggestions on design preferences. She stated that approval of the project is not acceptance of the project but rather acknowledgment that the project is coming. Mr. DuMontelle suggested that the FHWA Certification Review to take place in January should engage the concerns of the different MPO Committees.

In response to a question from Mr. Martin, Mr. Sarvis said the plans for Section 4 will begin after a Record of Decision is issued on the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and will probably be done fall of next year. Mr. Sarvis will continue to communicate with the MPO as the project advances. Mr. Martin asked if a schedule has been established for the other sections of I-69 from Bloomington north to Martinsville. Mr. Sarvis replied there is no schedule, though he hopes the NEPA process will begin next year. Mr. Martin asked what the public's opportunity will be to impact the design of future sections of the project. Mr. Sarvis replied that the opportunity will exist. Mr. Sarvis said there is an opportunity to engage INDOT on design aspects after the Record of Decision has been issued. Mr. Sarvis also mentioned October 28th is the last day of the public comment period on the Draft EIS.

Mr. Milroy expressed objection to how the public hearing in Greene County was conducted whereby the public was only allowed two minutes to comment. Mr. Sarvis stated this is standard process to allow everyone an opportunity to speak and that comments could also be submitted via email, letter, or in person at the project office. Mr. Milroy suggested that INDOT engage the Citizens Advisory Committee more directly on design aspects of projects. Ms. Cox-Ash expressed frustration over past experiences in which she was not allowed to give public comment on the project. Mr. Ash stated

INDOT has a history of not listening to the public. Mr. Sarvis apologized for past experiences in which public comment was not taken seriously but assured the Committee that they are taken seriously now.

Mr. Baker said this vote amounts to approval of the project. He felt INDOT has not held up their end of the bargain when it comes to cooperation. INDOT can impose consequences upon the MPO that make the consideration of the project unbalanced. This is different than how the MPO considers other projects. Mr. DuMontelle suggested there might also be consequences on the State if the project does not advance because of the money invested in the project to date. He also stated that the alignment of the corridor was decided as part of Tier I of the NEPA process and is no longer under consideration. It should be understood that as an interstate highway, the impacts and benefits go far beyond the Bloomington area. FHWA is involved in the process to make sure the project develops in a way that works with the community. Mr. Ash supported the upgrade of SR 57 and SR 67 as the alignment for I-69. Mr. DuMontelle reiterated the corridor has been set taking into consideration benefits and cost with each alignment. Many people desire easy access to Bloomington and the University which played a part in the decision of the alignment.

Mr. Miller stated the situation would be much better if the big picture decisions are made by the State and Federal governments but that the local governments have reasonable input and influence on design specifics. However, the only information before the CAC for consideration is the route with no specifics provided on design details. He stated it doesn't make sense that communities need to approve the alignment of a national road. It would be better if the community understood what was going to happen and have an ability to influence it. Mr. Jacobs said that as a lifelong resident of Bloomington, he felt the need has presented itself for I-69. We have industries, such as tourism and education, which could benefit from construction of the freeway. There are things the community can control, but the freeway isn't among them. That being said, the community would be better served by having a seat at the table in the planning of the road than to deny the project and not be involved in the process.

Ms. Henriot stated the devil is in the details and restated concerns she has heard from community members about the unknown aspects of the project, such as which adjacent roads will remain open. She felt there is not sufficient information about the project to make an informed decision. Mr. Sarvis responded that decisions are still being made about the project. He gave the examples that the alignment has shifted and overpasses have been added because of public comment received. He also stated that the process is done in steps and it is difficult to make final design determinations before other work is done, such as geo-technical and survey analysis. Mr. DuMontelle added that FHWA only allows INDOT to proceed so far before they are told to stop so the public and other agencies can review the findings.

Mr. Miller said he thought the whole process is broken. It doesn't make sense to have local communities approve state projects in the TIP. Mr. DuMontelle replied that federal law dictates this process. He also said that the statewide TIP and the local TIP must complement one another. Neither document should conflict with the other. The process



is meant to foster cooperation and to serve the needs of the entire public, including the needs of people passing through an area. Mr. Sarvis stated most of the concerns he has heard from this area are focused on Section 5. Section 5 will generally follow the SR37 corridor from Bloomington north to Indianapolis. Sections 5 & 6 will present different challenges than Section 4 since they follow an existing route through urban areas instead of building on new terrain. This means there will be different planning coordination opportunities to determine how the project should proceed. Ms. Flum stated that the Section 5 Office has met with MPO, City, and County staff to get input on some of these planning issues. Ms. Hamman stated the Section 5 Office is located across from Walmart and is open on Wednesdays between 9am and 4pm. She is also willing to meet with people by appointment. Mr. Hess displayed the I-69 project webpage.

Mr. Jacobs motioned to approve the TIP amendment to include the segment of I-69 Section 4. Mr. Kehrberg seconded. The motion failed 2-6-2.

Mr. Miller suggested a future presentation to the CAC on design considerations of Section 5. Mr. Sarvis suggested an informal meeting at the project office. Mr. Murray suggested inviting FHWA back to discuss these issues with the CAC.

VI. Old Business

A. Public Participation Plan Amendment – This issue did not require a vote of the CAC and was carried forward to the November meeting.

VIII. Communications from Committee Members

A. Topic Suggestions for future agendas – Mr. Hess reported on behalf of Barbara Salisbury that the Council on Community Accessibility will host a transportation work session at the Monroe County Public Library on November 15th at 4pm. The focus will be on how to better engage the disabled community in the transportation planning process.

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- A. Policy Committee – November 5, 2010 at 1:30pm (Council Chambers)
- B. Technical Advisory Committee – November 17, 2010 at 10:00am (McCloskey Room)
- C. Citizens Advisory Committee – November 17, 2010 at 6:30pm (McCloskey Room)

Adjournment (~8:00 PM)

*These minutes were accepted by the CAC at their regular meeting held on January 26, 2011.
(RH: 1/26/2011)*