



**Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Oct 26, 2011 McCloskey Conference Room 135, City Hall**

Technical Advisory Committee minutes are transcribed in a summarized outline manner. Audio recordings are on file with the City of Bloomington Planning Department.

Attendance

Technical Advisory Committee: John Carter (MCCSC), John Collisson (County Highway), Jane Fleig (CBU), Laura Haley (GIS Coordinator), Tom Micuda (City Planning Director), Doug Norton (Rural Transit), Adrian Reid (City Engineering), Andrea Roberts (Deputy Director Public Works), Jim Ude (INDOT), Mike Trexler (City Controller), and Dave Williams (City Parks).

Others: Sandra Flum (INDOT), Justin Wykoff (City Engineering), Clint Sparks (American Structure-point), and Rod Spaw (Herald-Times).

MPO Staff: Josh Desmond, Raymond Hess and Jane Weiser.

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes:

A. October 26, 2011--- Tom Micuda moved approval. Dave Williams seconded. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

III. Communications from the Chair—No report.

IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees

A. Updates on BMCMPO funded projects—Mr. Collisson said Vernal Pike should be finished by mid-November. Mr. Reid said the City is finishing up their last few parcels on S. Rogers St. The Sare/Rogers project is nearly done with right-of-way acquisition. Bids for that project will be in mid-April.

B. Citizens Advisory Committee—Mr. Hess reported the CAC will consider the same agenda as the TAC plus a report on TAC comments regarding the ADA policy statements. Any changes will be reported to the TAC next month.

C. ADA Transition Plans—Mr. Desmond reported that the last meeting of the internal team for ADA Transition plans for the City was on Oct. 6. As of that date the City has adopted/endorsed PROWAG as the official standards for construction. A grievance procedure has been agreed upon. The team is looking at an inventory of existing intersections and sidewalks. They are working on a system to prioritize locations in need of improvement.

V. Reports from the MPO Staff

A. Long Range Transportation Task Force—Meetings with the Task Force are continuing. Staff received feedback and is working on a draft request for qualifications for a firm to develop the Plan's travel demand model. Mr. Micuda said that we may be seeking assistance from the County for consulting money in addition to what we will get in 2012.

VI. Old Business

VII. New Business

A. FY2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

a. **Removal of I-69 Section 4 (Ruff)**—At the Policy Committee (PC) meeting last summer, the Policy Committee was presented with an amendment to both TIPs for inclusion of the construction phase I-69 Section 4. A subcommittee was created with 6 different PC members—Mark Kruzan, Mark Stoops, Lynn Coyne, Kent McDaniel, Jack Baker and Richard Martin. The PC was given an opportunity to ask INDOT questions about I-69. This subcommittee was going to work with INDOT and FHWA on reviewing those questions and responses prior to the next PC meeting on Nov. 4. Staff has compiled that information under the Nov. 4 PC bullet. The TIP amendment from Councilmember Ruff presented after the Sept 9 meeting calls for removing I-69 from this older TIP. It is considered a major amendment since it is a cost change of 100%. Staff enacted at 30-day written public comment period which ends today. We have gotten about 100 public comments so far. There was a comment from FHWA that right-of-way and engineering funds have already been obligated. We received a letter from Audra Blasdel of INDOT indicating that an amendment such as this would not be accepted by the State. If we submitted a TIP with an amendment for the removal of I-69, the governor would not sign off on it. At the Nov. 4th PC meeting, there will be 3 different TIP amendments related to I-69.

Mr. Micuda pointed out that there is a meeting this afternoon with this subcommittee of the PC, INDOT and FHWA to talk about the questions and answers and to discuss getting more information. Mr. Williams asked Mr. Hess if the governor signs all TIP amendments. Mr. Hess said yes.

Mr. Micuda said that it seems that this body has consistently been concerned about impact to local projects as a result of I-69 not being in the TIP. This amendment in particular complicates things since this is the TIP we are working under as opposed to the new TIP. He suggested that the TAC make a negative recommendation or no recommendation since more information is coming in. Mr. Reid asked if Mr. Ruff gave a reason for this amendment. He didn't think there was a compelling reason to take it out at the moment. He would suggest a negative recommendation. *****Ms. Fleig moved for a negative recommendation. Mr. Collisson seconded.** Mr. Williams asked if Mr. Micuda was expecting a scenario at the meeting today where Mr. Ruff might remove his amendment. Mr. Micuda said no. He expected the discussion this afternoon to clarify PC positions and information for the Nov. 4th meeting. He said that since this project is already obligated, removing it from the TIP might not affect the current status of the project. The impacts are either unknown or potentially really significant for the community. We also have objections from the sponsor, INDOT, regarding a different entity removing an INDOT project. *****The motion was approved by a unanimous vote.**

b. **Bicycle Lockers for Downtown Transfer Facility (BT)**—*Recommendation requested.* Mr. Hess said that BT has received discretionary transit grants totaling \$24,900 plus a local match of \$5,100 for the purchase of bike lockers at their Downtown Transfer Facility site. BT hopes that this will help increase commutes by alternative transportation. This needs to be

reflected in the TIP. *****Mr. Micuda moved for approval. Ms. Fleig seconded.** The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

VIII. Communications from Committee Members (non-agenda items)

A. Topic Suggestions for future agendas

Ms. Fleig said she wondered if the TAC should have a member on the PC. Is this something that could be brought to discussion at a future TAC meeting? Mr. Micuda said there is no prohibition of this but adding members tends to get hotly discussed because you are changing the dynamics of the particular board or commission. Adding one member would bring their membership to 14 and most boards are made up of an odd number of members. Mr. Hess said there is no prohibition of this. It would require amendment to the bylaws approved by a 2/3 majority vote. PC is made up of people who serve on commissions that are elected. TAC has appointments from some non-elected entities. A lot of other MPOs have a joint session with PC and TAC. We used to have that but in the past decided to separate the two in hopes of a more distinct voice from the two committees. The recommendations of the TAC and CAC may not play as significant a role when the PC is discussing an issue that some of their members feel very strongly about. Most of the time, the TAC and CAC positions are usually considered about 90% of the time except on really big issues like I-69. Staff would craft a bylaw amendment if the TAC would like. Ms. Fleig said she hoped that the issue could be discussed in more detail at a future meeting.

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- A. MPO Winter Open House – December 9, 2011 at 12:00 p.m. (McCloskey Room)**
- B. Technical Advisory Committee – January 25, 2012 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)**
- C. Citizens Advisory Committee – January 25, 2012 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)**
- D. Policy Committee – February 10, 2012 at 1:30 p.m. (location to be determined)**

Adjournment

These minutes were adopted by the TAC at their regular meeting held on 1-25-12(JFW).