



Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
February 24, 2012 McCloskey Conference Room 135, City Hall

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

Policy Committee: Michelle Allen (FHWA), Jack Baker (Bloomington Plan Commission), Susie Johnson (City Public Works), Lynn Coyne (IU Real Estate), Richard Martin (Monroe County Plan Commission), Kent McDaniel (Bloomington Public Transportation Corp.), Patrick Murray (CAC Chair), Andy Ruff (Bloomington City Council), Jim Stark (INDOT), Mark Stoops (Monroe Co. Commissioner), Dan Swafford (proxy--Ellettsville Town Council), Julie Thomas (Monroe County Council), and Bill Williams (County Highway).

Others: Adrian Reid (TAC Chair), Lew May (Bloomington Transit), and the following residents and citizens: Clark Sorensen, Vicky Sorensen, Dee Owens, Charles Newmann, Mary Ann Williams, Thomas Tokarski, Karen Wisniewski, Phil Wisniewski, and Tom Glastrus.

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

- I. **Call to Order** –Kent McDaniel called the meeting to order.
- II. **Election of Officers**
 - A. **Chair** – **Andy Ruff** nominated **Kent McDaniel** for **Policy Committee (PC) Chair**. **Richard Martin** seconded the motion. **The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**
 - B. **Vice-Chair** – **Mr. Martin** nominated **Jack Baker** for **Vice-Chair**. **Mark Stoops** seconded. **The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**
- III. **Approval of Minutes:**
 - A. **November 4, 2011** – **Mr. Martin** moved **approval of the minutes**. **Julie Thomas** seconded the motion. **The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.**
- IV. **Communications from the Chair** – Mr. McDaniel reported about the House’s proposed elimination of the mass transit account which would disconnect it from the gas tax. This would be very dangerous for BT and Rural Transit. This is the same thing that the General Assembly did to Public Mass Transportation fund last year. Both of these funds have existed for 29 years. The news from the House today is that this proposal will be withdrawn.
- V. **Reports from Officers and/or Committees**
 - A. **Citizens Advisory Committee** – Mr. Murray reported that staff updated the CAC on the Long Range Transportation Plan, the I-69 Subcommittee and other quarterly project reports. The CAC approved a recommendation to amend the TIP to include 3 new expenditures for BT.
 - B. **Technical Advisory Committee** – Mr. Reid reported that the TAC reviewed the same items as CAC. There is nothing more to report that you aren’t discussing in this meeting.
 - C. **Policy Committee I-69 Subcommittee** – Mr. Martin said the subcommittee has met twice since the last PC meeting. They came up with a list of discussable concerns. They have been discussing these with INDOT and FHWA. In the interim as part of those concerns, the State

has extended an offer to the 3 municipal jurisdictions served by the MPO (Bloomington, Monroe County & Ellettsville) to become formal participating agencies in the Section 5 NEPA action which will result in the FEIS for Section 5. This was discussed by the subcommittee in Feb. The minutes have been posted on the MPO website. Another meeting has been set for Feb. 29 where they will discuss Section 4 and Section 5. Another meeting will be scheduled in March. We would like to see the TIP amendments postponed until a special meeting in March so that we can assemble this information, review it with MPO members and to have the time to what we need to do so that when we do have this issue on an agenda for a meeting, we don't have any outstanding questions at that point in time as there have been in the past. Staff has been looking at a date in March and we think that is probably the appropriate thing to do so that we can focus on that particular issue for that meeting.

*****Jim Stark moved we move the Old Business on the agenda regarding the inclusion of I-69 to the March PC meeting. Mr. Martin seconded.**

Andy Ruff noted that the Section 4, as I recall, of I-69 was as recently as 2010 called for construction to begin in 2016 according to the 2010 STIP. The hell bent pace at which it has been moving forward seems not based on any urgent reality or practical. It seems more political. As long as this Section 4 question is not resolved and considering that very recently the schedule was for 2016, I would ask that INDOT stop all activity in Section 4 from now until this body takes an action.

Julie Thomas thanked the subcommittee for their work. She asked Mr. Martin if he was referring to the specific inter-agency agreement or about all the questions that have been posed. Mr. Martin said they want to get as many of the posed questions answered as possible. They may not be satisfied with all of the answers we get but they may be the extent of the answer that is possible. Ms. Thomas requested that those questions that are posed include the questions that were posed at the last meeting that were just approved as part of the minutes here. Mr. Martin said he would. ***** Mr. McDaniel asked for a voice vote to accept the report of the subcommittee. The vote was unanimous.**

Mr. McDaniel asked the PC how they wanted to deal with public comment at the next meeting dealing with I-69. We have already satisfied the legal obligations by having public comment on the same issue. This is just a continuation of that discussion. So, we have the option to not take public comment at the next meeting. Another option would be that we could declare that this is a continuation of the same thing that we did at the last meeting and only allow people to testify if they did not previously testify. We don't allow people to speak more than once on a topic.

*****Mr. McDaniel asked for a vote on Mr. Stark's motion. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.**

Mr. McDaniel continued discussing the options for public comment as above. The 3rd option would be to open the floor for any public comment. Mr. Ruff suggested that people attending a meeting concerning I-69 would be very upset by not being allowed to speak. *****Mark Stoops moved to accept full public comment at the March meeting. Mr. Ruff seconded.**

Lynn Coyne added that if we have public comment that it be civil and respectful and not insult anybody. The last time a couple of people were out of line. Mr. Stoops said that is always the goal but you can't control what somebody at the podium is saying. INDOT and FHWA have seen this before. It is something that happens. Mr. Coyne said that he didn't say that it can be controlled but that it can't be condoned. We should set the standard of our expectation is civil behavior and respectful treatment of everybody. Mr. Stoops asked how it was condoned before. Mr. Coyne said he saw that it happened and they were allowed to continue to do it. Mr. Stoops said that a letter from INDOT held the PC and Mr. McDaniel accountable. Mr. Hess said that Mr. McDaniel met with MPO staff as well as Police Department staff and we have formalized a more coherent procedure than the last time. He anticipates that this will lead to better control of the meeting if people are talking out of turn, etc. Ms. Johnson suggested that they carefully monitor the occupancy limits of this room. We may have been over the limit at that meeting. Mr. Ruff said that one of the reasons he nominated Mr. McDaniel for another term as Chair was because of the way he handled the last meeting. He thought Mr. McDaniel did an excellent job and he thought the letters received from other agencies criticizing the meeting and the conduct of the Chair was completely out-of-line and even an attempt to divert attention from the real issues. There was a very small amount of the meeting that was unacceptable.

Mr. Martin said that at the last meeting many people left without speaking. People who were against I-69 spoke early and very few of the people speaking for the adoption of the TIP. He has spoken as a remonstrator often and understands the frustration that can occur when there are a lot of people with similar views speaking in succession on a particular issue. Remonstrators can feel very hopeless about their chance to speak and subsequently leave. He would like to make sure that all positions are in fact able to speak without waiting forever or even feeling intimidated by the speakers. It is inappropriate to tolerate intimidation in a public meeting. Mr. Stoops suggested having a pro and con list so that you can alternate the speakers with differing points of view. Mr. Ruff suggested having 2 podiums—one for pro and one for con. That has worked well with City Council. Mr. Martin asked if he could offer a friendly amendment that would call for 2 podiums (one pro and one con) and alternating between them for public comment. Several PC members indicated that they could informally agree to this procedure. Mr. Stark he would like to see the crowd controlled when people make their comments so that they don't feel threatened one way or the other. Mr. McDaniel agreed completely but added that unfortunately the crowd cannot always be controlled. We have an understanding with the Police Department that if someone gets out of hand they will be removed. *****The question was called on Mr. Stoops' motion. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.**

VI. Reports from the BMCMPPO Staff

A. FY 2012 2nd Quarter Progress Report –Mr. Hess presented the report. He focused on the MPO Planning Funds budget. We are at about 27% of our total budget for the FY 2012 UPWP PL funds had been spent and about 73% remains on the table. We have some big ticket projects to do yet. They will take a good amount of that money.

B. Quarterly Project Tracking –Mr. Hess presented the report. Projects that are identified in the TIP program receive a Planning Emphasis Area from FHWA and a Best Practice from INDOT to suggest that we monitor these projects in their developmental stages as it relates to

design, preliminary engineering, and right-of-way acquisition to make sure that projects stay on task, schedule and budget. That is the purpose of this report. Every project has contact information, the latest status update, cross-references against the TIP, shows current status and its relationship to our Complete Streets Policy. The way the report is organized is by project sponsor. He pointed out the Administrative Modifications section. They are very minor TIP amendments to existing projects. The procedure is that we notify all PC members of the requested modification. The PC members have 3 days to object to the Chair and Director signing off on that. If there is a voiced objection, we bring it back before the board as a regular agenda item. If there are no objections, we approve those. We are adding this part of the project tracking to make the public and members of the PC aware of these modifications. In 2007, we set aside 5% of our Surface Transportation Program Funds into a special pot for Change Orders in order to provide funds for any unforeseen cost changes. Most of that money has been spent. Only \$5,010 remains. The Change Order reserve pot resets with another \$150,000 at the next fiscal year—July 1.

Mr. Martin noted that the intersection SR 46 improvement program at Smith Rd. did not score high enough in the State's Hazard Analysis Tool. Are there ways in which locally we can devote funds to do modifications or does this have to be State-initiated and State-managed project since it's a state highway? Mr. Hess said that he understood it any improvements along a state road corridor would have to have the consent and approval of INDOT. Mr. Stark said that local communities do work on state roads all across the state. It is really just a mechanism where the LPA need to work with the district and make a recommendation. It is like a permitting process from the state.

Mr. Martin asked Mr. Williams why we did not receive TIGER III funding from FHWA for the Fullerton Pike construction at SR 37 to Sare Rd. What impact does that have on your timeline? Mr. Williams said that they are proceeding with preliminary engineering. At this point, it is not hurting anything. Mr. Martin asked about the denied additional funding requested for Karst Farm Greenway Phase IIA. What is the impact? Mr. Williams said that that amount is tied to the Unionville Trail. The Karst Farm II would be coming back to this.

Mr. Martin asked about the Old SR 37 connection at Dunn St. Is anything being done? Mr. Reid said they have started early coordination and are in the preliminary engineering phase.

C. 2012 MPO Conference –Mr. Desmond said that we are hosting the annual statewide MPO Conference this fall in Bloomington at the Convention Center (Oct. 16-18). We are developing the speaker list and schedule. All MPO members are encouraged to attend.

D. 2013-2014 Unified Planning Work Program – Mr. Desmond said staff is developing the 2013-2014 work program. Our budget for that is about \$7500 less in PL funds than the last couple of years. That will not impact us very much. FHWA and INDOT have directed our attention to 4 new key issues or PEAs. Three are carried over from the last Work Program— Planning and environmental linkages, quarterly project tracking and reports, and ADA Transition Plans for Ellettsville, Bloomington and Monroe County completed by the end of this calendar year. The new PEA is to adjust our Urban Area boundaries and MPO Planning Area boundaries based on the last census results. The urbanized area and the boundary determine the

how much funding we get and where the funding can be spent. We will carry over the Long Range Transportation Plan and the MPO Conference. We anticipate bringing a final draft to the PC in April so that we can submit it to INDOT and FHWA for review before it becomes final. We need to get our new funding as of July 1, 2012.

E. Long Range Transportation Plan Task Force – Mr. Desmond said staff intends to hire a consultant for the technical analysis component of the LRTP. The RFQ will be distributed within the next 2 weeks. We hope to have a firm under contract by the end of this fiscal year. The consultant will work on the travel demand model and additional technical data analysis while the report will be written by staff after input from the MPO and the public.

F. Transportation Legislation Reauthorization – Mr. Desmond reported on the transportation re-authorization proposals before both houses of Congress. Neither has been heard by the houses as a whole yet. Under discussion is a change in population thresholds necessary to authorize the existence of an MPO. He and Mr. McDaniel have submitted a memo to the Indiana MPO Council voicing their concerns. The Council was collecting a packet of communications to be submitted by our Congressional delegation from Indiana. Congressman Young met with Mr. Desmond and Mr. McDaniel recently. Mr. McDaniel added that if the 200,000 population threshold is upheld, 7 out of Indiana's 14 MPOs would be eliminated. That would put us at a severe disadvantage in competing for federal funding. Congressman Young contacted us because of a provision from Congressman Bucshon of Indiana's 8th District that says that if there is a conflict between an MPO Policy Committee and the Department of Transportation over an Interstate issue, the Governor can do whatever he wants. Mr. Stoops asked if there was a mechanism to become a multi-regional MPO. Mr. Desmond said he didn't know the specific rules. Mr. Williams said that the County is very concerned with the off-system bridge program. The Forest Service says that they may be hit by this legislation, too.

G. 2010 Crash Report – Vince Caristo reported. This report covers the years 2008-2010. (See report for details.) He pointed out the highlights of the report and informed the PC about proposed changes to the report in the future. This year we improved our methodology from previous years. The 5 criteria considered include the type of vehicles involved, severity of the crash, time of day, location and primary crash factor. Fatalities and bike/pedestrian accidents are reviewed. In the next report, on the table of the top 50 crash locations we would like to list the change in rank from the prior year. Throughout the report we would like to highlight locations where recent improvements have been made or planned for the near future. They would like to add an analysis of crash frequency at intersections. The TAC asked that crash locations be identified as to city or county. Mr. Martin asked why some high crash locations are not listed on the HSIP list. Mr. Caristo said that HSIP locations must have at least 1 fatal or incapacitating injury at that location. Ms. Johnson praised the report and said it will be an extremely useful tool. Mr. Ruff said he would like to see the crash frequency data as soon as possible. Mr. Caristo said that the data for the next report is already available. He would try to figure out the best way to add the frequency data.

VII. Old Business – Action Requested on all Old Business*

A. Policy Committee Meeting Recordings on CATS – Mr. Hess asked the PC to decide if they want all meetings, some meetings or no meetings to be recorded by CATS on a regular

basis. It makes it easier for the public to know how to follow the meetings. Also, meeting rooms and staffs' presentation depend on whether the meeting is recorded or not. It is important for the PC and for CATS to know what will happen on a regular basis. Mr. McDaniel asked for committee opinions. Mr. Ruff asked if the PC could ask CATS to tape unless we tell them not to. Mr. Hess said that CATS is looking for new programming material and would be willing to tape them on a regular basis. What is the downside to having CATS tape every meeting? Mr. Hess and Mr. Desmond said that they didn't see a downside to it. Mr. Desmond said staff is just looking for guidance from the PC. Mr. McDaniel told Mr. Ruff said that in previous discussions some members of the PC had noted how meetings in Council Chambers did change the dynamic of the meeting. He felt that people might be more comfortable literally talking to each other around a table. It is possible that once I-69 is not on their agendas, people might not be as interested in their meetings. Mr. Ruff thought that there is a growing interest in the MPO's work. Ms. Thomas agreed that there is a different feel to the other room although 13 people cannot all sit around that table. *****Mr. Ruff moved that the Policy Committee meet in Council Chambers with CATS televising the meetings. Ms. Thomas seconded.** Jack Baker supported the idea of transparency via CATS taping the meetings. Mr. McDaniel asked for public comment. Scott Wells agreed with Mr. Baker. He liked taxpayers to have the chance to see how the money is spent. CATS participation gives the public the choice to watch the meetings from home. *****The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- (Items B & C were moved to the March PC meeting by PC action and not discussed.)*
- B. FY 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment
I-69 Section 4 (Construction) (INDOT)**
 - C. FY 2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment
a. I-69 Section 4 (project addition) (INDOT)**

VIII. New Business – Action Requested on all New Business*

A. Coordinated Human Services and Public Transportation Plan Update – Mr. Hess said that the PC adopted the Coordinated Plan in 2007. The purpose of this plan is to link transportation human service providers to help fill the gaps in transportation services for 3 distinct populations—older adults, persons of low or no income and persons with disabilities. The idea is to engage with different community organizations involved with transportation and serving the needs of these communities to come up with a list of transportation providers, a list of community needs and then strategies to address those needs. SAFETEA-LU created 3 funding sources: 5310 is used for purchase of vehicles for non-profit organizations, (5316) JARC (Job Access and Reverse Commute) funding targeted to help persons use transportation services and (5317) New Freedom Funding targeted at persons with disabilities. Staff felt that it is time to update the plan. We have been meeting with the Mobility Steering Committee. The update you have before you is the same plan that was adopted in 2007 with some additions. The additions are outlined in the memo. Mr. Hess presented the changes. We got a positive recommendation from both the CAC and the TAC. Ms. Johnson asked what it would mean to add for-profit corporations to the mix. Mr. Hess said they would add a little more competition to the mix. Ms. Johnson asked Mr. May about the effect on BT. Mr. May said the BT was part of the Mobility Steering Committee. There will be a little more competition state-wide for these funds. BT has not had trouble in the past getting the funds that they apply for from JARC funds

or New Freedom funding. Mr. Stoops asked how tied is this funding to the MPO to the boundary. Or can we look at this as extending to the county as a whole. Mr. Hess said he didn't really know that. The State has a state-wide plan and we have tried to get some coordination between their plan and ours. Mr. Stoops asked for the link to the state plan.

*****Ms. Johnson moved approval. Mr. Coyne seconded.** There was no public comment. **The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.**

B. FY 2010-2013 & FY 2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment –

Mr. May presented the amendments to the TIP. BT received some discretionary grant awards late last year for projects that were not included in the original TIP. We are also going to pursue some new discretionary awards in this coming year so those need to be included in the TIP. We have some new projects that we propose to use our federal funding for.

- a. **Bicycle Lockers for Downtown Transfer Facility (BT)**
- b. **Voice Enunciators (BT)**
- c. **35 Foot Buses (BT)** (2 additional hybrid busses)
- d. **Fuel Capitalization (BT)** In FY2012 only, BT can capitalize fuel at a rate of 80/20.
- e. **Maintenance Facility Exhaust System Upgrade (BT)** Needs to retrofit their systems to be able to work on and exhaust higher temperature emissions.

Mr. Hess added that the CAC and TAC recommended approval of the last 3. The first 2 were recommended at previous meetings. Mr. McDaniel said he was interested in the impact on Campus Bus. What is the cost per bay? Mr. May said it is roughly \$6500 per bay for 9 bays. Mr. Martin asked if fuel capitalization amounts to a savings in this fiscal year that can be applied elsewhere. Mr. May said it is not a savings. It allows us to use more of our regular federal funding for fuel costs than we could previously. It will save us some local funds. It will help us on our local reserves at the end of the year.

*****Mr. Coyne moved amendment to the Transportation Improvement Program as outlined in the materials for bike lockers, voice enunciators, 35-foot buses, fuel capitalization and maintenance facility exhaust system upgrade. Mr. Martin seconded.** (There was no public comment.) **The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.**

IX. Communications from Committee Members (*non-agenda items*)

A. Topic Suggestions for future agendas

X. Upcoming Meetings

***Mr. McDaniel noted that there would be an I-69 Subcommittee meeting on Feb. 29 at 1:30 (McCloskey Room)**

- A. **Technical Advisory Committee – March 28, 2012 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)**
- B. **Citizens Advisory Committee – March 28, 2012 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)**
- C. **Policy Committee – April 13, 2012 at 1:30 p.m. (Location TBD)**
- D. **Policy Committee Special meeting tentatively scheduled for March 9, 2012 at 1:30 pm (Council Chambers)**

Adjournment

The minutes were approved at the PC meeting held on May 11, 2012 (SR).