



I-69 Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

October 19, 2011 1:00pm

Hooker Room (#245), 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), and Kent McDaniel (Bloomington Public Transportation Corp.).

Others: L. Jacobs, C. Bassen, V. Sorenson, C. Sorenson, C. Gillenwater, K. Bauer, T. Tokarski, T. Maloney, D. Goldblatt, G. Frazee, L. Sowinski, D. Hewitt, and M. Hutton.

MPO Staff: Josh Desmond and Raymond Hess.

The meeting opened with 3 of 6 members present at 1:10 PM.

Review of INDOT responses to questions continued with discussion highlights and member comments as follows:

(79) Mr. Martin noted the inclusion of wide roadway shoulders at bridges. He also noted that the list given in the response does not include Burch Road and that Burch Road was indicated as closed in the PMP. The issues will be discussed with Bill Williams.

(80) Mr. Martin noted that while the planning for I-69 pre-dates many of our most recent Alternative Transportation Plan documents, it does not pre-date all of them nor does it pre-date any of them in specification of details. Section 5 in particular has very specific plans already developed to integrate city and county networks. What we lack is commitment from INDOT to execute the plans developed largely with grants from INDOT and FHWA. Our alternative transportation facilities and commitment to them are a part of the competitive advantage this community offers and it must be sustained as planned to maintain that advantage.

(81) INDOT is clear that funding for I-69 cannot be used for Alternative Transportation projects as such but is willing to accommodate opportunities traversing the corridor. The difficulty will be facilities like the I-65/SR46 interchange in Columbus. In some specific areas along I-69 it may be desirable to use the corridor to connect off-corridor facilities as they are implemented locally.

(82) Mr. Martin indicated that the MPO needs to respond to the INDOT letter of July 11, 2011. The claim in that letter regarding the procedures followed by the MPO is incorrect.

(92) The question asks about a specific process suggested by FHWA and it is evident that INDOT does not use that approach. Mr. Hess stated that they may use aspects of a documented approach but there appears to be no way for us as an MPO to link with that process or determine if aspects are missing. Mr. Martin indicated that responses from FHWA lead him to believe that a more formal process is to be available.

(93) Mr. Martin noted that inclusion of Section 5 in the STIP cannot occur without BMCMPPO inclusion in the TIP, completion of all FHWA planning requirements, and demonstration of fiscal constraint. There are illustrative entries for Section 5 in the 2012-2015 STIP.

(101) Mr. Martin asked about the need for Injection Well permits. Mr. Baker stated that may refer to drilling lubricants used during boring operations.

(105) Mr. Martin noted this as another NON-Response from INDOT. The question requires an answer that identifies adherence to the 3C process no matter what particular projects are included or excluded from the BMCMPPO TIP.

(106) Mr. asked what feedback is provided to the MPO and LPA's when funding is denied. Mr. Hess replied that unfunded projects can have technical problems or fail to include information that results in a higher score. Most of the time they know if a project will be accepted before they actually apply, and do not submit projects that cannot succeed.

(107) see (19)

(108) see (106)

(109) see ((82)

Having completed the review of responses, Mr. Martin asked Mr. Desmond to discuss the "at risk" projects should the 2012 – 2015 TIP continue to be rejected by the Governor. Mr. Desmond identified a report for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 TIP projects by LPA with the ranking by dollars at risk. Clearly Bloomington Transit operating funds are most at risk. Mr. McDaniel stated that about 57% of BT funds come through the state. The IU bus system is self-funded through student fees and it also contributes \$1 million to BT for unlimited student, staff, faculty, and visitor access to BT. If the system is downsized as a result of lost funding then the proposed bus garage upgrade would not be needed. (The report is available on the MPO web site).

Mr. Martin asked staff if there was any indication that other funding identified in the 2010 – 2013 TIP was at risk. Mr. Desmond replied that they had no communication indicating that those funds were at risk and many of the projects had been obligated and were proceeding. Mr. Hess indicated that while they had seen some temporary delays for a variety of reasons, all projects are on-tract. Mr. Martin asked if a project status update would be given at the MPO meeting and Mr. Hess said yes.

Mr. Desmond notified that in response to Mr. Martin's invitation to Ms. Flum for Monday, he and been copied on an email stating that she would be unavailable. Mr. Martin stated that it was vital for INDOT to meet with the sub-committee to identify a means for resolving the impasse. Perhaps a superior is available to meet. Time was getting short for preparation to meet the October 28th packet deadline.

Mr. McDaniel asked about the meeting agenda and sub-committee report schedule. Mr. Hess stated that there would be TIP amendments to consider beside the I-69 request. Mr. Baker suggested that they modify the agenda to move all I-69 items toward the end, that the sub-committee report be first in that group, followed by old business of the INDOT request, and then new business to related to I-69 in the current TIP. Mr. McDaniel asked Mr. Martin to give the I-69 Sub-committee report. Mr. Martin agreed and identified that the packet material should include a collated question and response list to be prepared by staff, the sub-committee meeting minutes, and the At Risk analysis. He indicated that he was preparing a "Concerns Document" with two primary sections, one for a no-build decision by the MPO, and one for a build decision by the MPO. Each section will list the concerns expressed during



Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization
I-69 Subcommittee

the review of questions. Mr. Baker agreed to prepare a "Major Topics" with a couple of sentences for each topic to be sent to sub-committee members for editing. Both Mr. Martin and Mr. Baker identified the need to begin negotiations with INDOT for ways in which to resolve the impasse. Mr. Martin agreed to work with Mr. McDaniel on a response to the July 11st letter from Mr. Cline at INDOT.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Minutes prepared by Richard Martin