



Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
Mar. 8, 2013 Council Chambers 115, City Hall

*Policy Committee minutes are transcribed in a summarized outline manner. Audio recordings are on file with the City of Bloomington Planning Department. **Technical difficulties –an incomplete audio recording was produced for this meeting. See DVD for complete recording.***

Policy Committee: Jack Baker (Bloomington Plan Commission), Susie Johnson (Public Works), Richard Martin (County Plan Commission, Kent McDaniel (BT), Iris Kiesling (County Commission), Andy Ruff City Council), David Sabbagh (MPO-CAC), Cheryl Munson (County Council), Mark Kruzan (Bloomington Mayor), Ryan Gallagher (INDOT- Seymour), and Bill Williams (County Highway).

Others: Michelle Allen (FHWA), Adrian Reid (City Engineering), Mary Jo Hamman (Michael Baker), Tony McClellan (INDOT), Sandra Flum (INDOT), Christine Glaser (Green File Consulting Group), and Mick Harrison (CARR).

MPO Staff: Josh Desmond, Anna Dragovich, Scott Robinson, and Jane Weiser

I. Call to Order & Committee Introductions

II. Approval of Minutes:

A. **February 8, 2013 -- ***The minutes were unanimously approved.**

III. Communications from the Chair – Mr. McDaniel reported on the successful Public Transit Day at the Indiana Statehouse in February. Several large underground tanks have been found on the site of the new Downtown Transit Terminal causing some temporary delays.

IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees

A. Citizens Advisory Committee – Mr. Sabbagh reported from the CAC. At the last meeting, they have a vigorous discussion of the Fullerton project involving government representatives and the public.

B. Technical Advisory Committee – Mr. Reid said the TAC appreciated the CAC report on the Fullerton project. He invited Mary Jo Hamman and Sandra Flum to update the TAC about progress on Section 5 of I-69. Ms. Hamman said the comment period for the DEIS has closed and Baker has been reviewing the 180 comments received. They received input from all participating agencies, surrounding counties, permitting agencies and other interested groups and individual citizens. They are working toward an FEIS and Record of Decision to be published in June 2013. In answer to a question from Mr. McDaniel, the participating agencies have been meeting generally once a month. Mr. McDaniel pointed out that there was a memo drafted by all the members of the Policy Committee to INDOT from the local collaboration committee put together by the Chamber of Commerce. Has there been an official response? Many comments concerned bicycle and pedestrian accommodation. We are looking at bicycle and pedestrian facilities on all of our cross-streets through the urban section of Bloomington. More study will be done on adding these amenities. They are looking at sidewalks on the south side of 2nd St. and a multiuse path on the north side. They are looking to include a multiuse path and bike lanes on both sides of the bridge on W. 3rd St. They plan to reuse the partial interchange at N. Walnut St. INDOT is working on a De Minimus Agreement to shift I-69 away from Wapehani Park.

Mr. Ruff said he considers I-69 project as one whole project. INDOT has opportunistically enjoyed moving back and forth between considering it segments of various sizes to address certain concerns and then looking at it as if it is a whole project to tout benefits. I am going to ask about Section 4 because I think it is relevant here even though we are talking about Section 5. He said that he had worked as an Erosion and Sediment Control professional for a decade relating to construction work. Why is work in

Section 4 in the terrain southwest of Bloomington to and including Greene County being done at what is unquestionably the absolute worst time to be doing the aggressive work that is being done. In a freeze/thaw period the soil is as wet and unstable as it ever is. From morning to night, huge equipment is being used with obscene consequences. Doing this kind of work at this time of year would not be recommended under any responsible construction plan. Can you answer why the work is so aggressively happening right now? Sandra Flum from INDOT said that the project that is being constructed in Section 4 is being constructed under the commitments that we made environmentally with US Fish and Wildlife and other resource agencies. One of those commitments is not being able to remove trees from the right-of-way outside of a window between April 1 and Nov. 15. That commitment requires that tree removal happens only between Nov. 15 and March 31. It is also when there is earthwork done at the same time. We have actively pursued erosion and sediment control. It is in place and working. Mr. Ruff said that the clearing of trees to form a pathway is because of the Indiana bat. We are going to see the type of construction work that would follow such clearing happening before November in Monroe County. After Nov. 1 would still not be the ideal time of year but it is a far better time than right now. Will we be seeing construction work that would have required clearing that couldn't have been done in November? Ms. Flum said clearing will happen before March 31 and construction happens any time between now and then after the clearing is done. Construction work can happen any time of the year under suitable conditions for the type of work that will be performed but clearing happens between Nov. 15 and March 31. Mr. Ruff asked if they are anticipating the construction work to be happening before November. Ms. Flum said that they started construction last year and they will continue to construct throughout the construction season and during suitable weather from now until the project is done.

V. Reports from the MPO Staff

A. MTP Task Force – Mr. Desmond presented a brief update on progress on the transportation plan. The Task Force met with the consultant and received a report. It was a productive discussion. The model is being fine tuned. They should be done with their on-board survey for BT. We went through a 2-week field test period to test our proposed household travel survey. This will help us start to model different types of trip-making behaviors for different types of people across our community. They sent a pre-test out to MPO members and City and County employees. We got over 200 responses. We will be informing the community that this new test is available next week. There will be more public meetings. We have identified some key stakeholder groups that we believe should have input on the plan. Mr. Martin noted that the survey that the MPO is about to launch can be somewhat daunting for people. He encouraged everyone to complete the survey. Partial completion doesn't help us at all. The more completed information we have, the better we can identify problems now and project further problems into the future. Mr. Sabbagh said he understood that this survey is based on a national survey. Mr. Desmond said that he understood that there is a set of national household travel data that we will blend into our data set. Mr. McDaniel asked when the general survey would go live. Mr. Desmond said there would be a press release for the new survey next week. Ms. Munson suggested that knowing the distance between your multiple stops it will be helpful.

VI. Old Business -- None

VII. New Business

A. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment

- i. Statewide Fracture Critical Bridge Inspections (INDOT)*** -- Ms. Dragovich said that the request is from INDOT. The amendment is in the TIP now. There is only funding for 2013. This amendment is to add money for 2014 and 2015. Mr. Martin said that he understands it--this amendment along with the other two that we did in September of last year are essentially to support this activity throughout the state not necessarily in our MPO. Mr. Desmond said it is a blanket contract for the entire state.

Mr. Martin said that people shouldn't think that we would be spending \$400,000 per year examining bridges here. Mr. Ruff asked if every MPO is approving the same thing. Who decides which bridges throughout the state get inspected? Mr. Desmond said that they are state road bridges. Whatever inventory or monitoring system they use will call up a certain round of bridges to be inspected on a regular basis. Mr. Ruff asked why we wouldn't have foreseen in 2013 the need that this is an ongoing program. Mr. Desmond said we bring forward what is requested of us and fix it later should it be necessary. Mr. Ruff said this seems like a funny request to him. It seems that this kind of thing would be routinely built into a budget and that MPOs wouldn't be approving money for things like statewide bridge inspections on a regular basis. Mr. Desmond said that this is the first time that he remembers having done a state-wide series of TIP amendments as opposed to things that are just within our MPO area. You would have to ask INDOT to clarify that. Ms. Allen said that she thought that this was to get the money into the TIP so that repairs could be made on a more timely basis rather than having to wait for a TIP amendment. Mr. Ruff asked what the source of the funding would be. Mr. Gallagher said he couldn't answer the specific question. He assumed that this would come from one of their 5 regular federal funds. Mr. Ruff asked if our MPO area has any bridges that would be in line quickly for this. Mr. Gallagher said the INDOT Bridge Section downtown would decide what needs inspected and on what routine basis it needs inspected.

Public Comment:

Mr. Harrison said he had a couple of questions but didn't know if there was anyone at the meeting who could answer them since they relate to Mr. Ruff's questions. Since the person from Federal Highway said it is the purpose of this type of funding to get it into the TIP in advance so that if you need it in an emergency basis, it would be available. If that were the logic, why wouldn't you have approved a budget for the entire TIP time period that has already been approved instead of only 2013? Why would you do that year by year? Isn't it required that any project approved in a TIP whether it is construction, maintenance, inspection, etc. has to be fiscally constrained before you can approve the TIP? Doesn't it have to be fiscally constrained (meaning you know where the funding is coming from) for the entire period of the TIP before you can approve it? If that is the case how could you have approved something like this for only one portion of the TIP period? Does anyone care to answer those questions?

Mr. McDaniel said we typically don't respond to questions from the public. It's a comment period. But there is additional discussion from the committee. If somebody wants to discuss that they are welcome to.

Mr. Harrison commented that you shouldn't approve this until you get those answers. Thank you.

Mr. Martin said that back in September we had 3 separate amendments that had to do with various kinds of bridge issues. This is the only one that did not have 3 years worth of funding attached to it. The submerged structures portion did and the others one did. He thought that each one of them was for ½ million dollars each. The total was \$1.5 million each year for the first year and \$1 million for the second and third because these 2 were not included in it at that point in time. He said that he hadn't been on the MPO long enough to know if we have been asked to do this before. He didn't recall that we have had to do it before. Was it in our previous TIP—this kind of a request? Mr. McDaniel said he didn't recall having done this before. Mr. Martin asked what has changed in federal law which would require us to put this in the TIP. Is the State now asking for federal funding for this activity whereas before this was not a federally funded activity but a State activity and therefore would not have to be in our TIP because it didn't require any federal money? He was a little uncomfortable last time and now that the discussion has happened again he was wondering again why this is here? He understood the



logic if we are going to use federal funds of doing it in advance. What he has not heard is why we are moving from a position of not having had to do this in the past to having to do it now. Ms. Allen said she could not speak to whether you've had to ask for funds for this. But she did know that in the past couple of years it is something that FHWA has noticed—where something hasn't been in the TIP and then there was a delay time. She thinks that might be spurring some of this statewide. Some MPOs have emergency provisions. Probably INDOT is looking at what types of things may have to happen on a statewide basis to get things into multiple TIPs so that we don't run into this problem. This may be a new approach for INDOT.

Mr. Martin said he didn't recall that this was part of FHWA's systematic review comments either. The last time you did your review of the MPO, I don't believe this was part of the comments. Ms. Allen agreed. Mr. Martin said he was assuming that this was new because of the issues of the bridges down south. Ms. Allen said there are other times when there is a HAZMAT issue where INDOT has to do something there. That is another thing that INDOT is looking at and considering whether they need to get something on a statewide basis so that we don't have a delay and get out and do federally funded work in an MPO area. This is probably just a way to kind of make sure that something needs to happen, it can happen in a timely manner.

Mr. Ruff said that these types of inspections and repairs have always happened when needed. He was very supportive of them happening but the fact that they have always been able to happen as needed and the fact that there is virtually no explanation or information that addresses any of the lines of questioning here in the packet. He didn't feel comfortable voting yes. He will vote no.

Ms. Munson said that she has not understood to her satisfaction the point of fiscal constraint for bridge inspections. Has money already been promised by INDOT for these 3 different years? Has that funding source been identified for these 3 years? Mr. Gallagher said he couldn't identify the funding without a member of the bridge team here to tell him the history of the funding. When we put together a biennium budget, we look forward. He thought he would ask the bridge people if this is what happened in this case. His guess was that we have identified that funding within that biennium budget period that we are getting approved through the legislature and now it's in this. That is why it is before us today. Mr. Ruff said he was trying to get at what the ultimate funding source or if it came from traditional highway funding revenues (federal and state). Keep in mind that using INDOT's own budget numbers fully 40.1% of all available traditional funding for 2013 is slated for I-69 in Section 4. To be able to throw these numbers around assuming that just because we are told that funds are there so therefore it is fiscally constrained—I don't think that is good enough or responsible. We could be told if there's a million dollars in one spot and then a bunch of projects point to that money saying that we have funds to pay for those million dollar projects. All of the projects together could equal \$10 million. That is not fiscally constrained. We are not supposed to be approving things that are not fiscally constrained. He said he didn't think that there is enough here in what we got to make any kind of determination.

Mr. Kruzan asked INDOT whether there is a preference that we vote on this today or tabling this until next month. He would rather put off the vote rather than to send a message that we are voting against critical bridge inspections. He didn't know enough about this to know what the dates are. He didn't have any expectation of receiving nitty gritty answers today. Mr. Desmond suggested that the motion be to postpone the vote. Mr. Gallagher said that was acceptable. INDOT could then have members of the teams involved to answer specific questions.

*****Mr. Kruzan moved to postpone voting on the TIP amendment. Mr. Gallagher seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.**

Mr. Kruzan asked about next month's meeting and the expectations that INDOT has in trying to get I-69 Section 5 into the TIP. The only thing he wanted to ask is whether there is an expectation that all of the questions that we have been working on since October 2012 will be answered prior to the vote to include the project in the

TIP. Ms. Flum with INDOT said they would hope to answer the committee's questions prior to standing before you next month. Mr. Kruzan said there has been great progress on Wapehani. That is an example of an issue that is moving but from his perspective he couldn't imagine that being finalized by the next meeting. He noted that it was accurately depicted by INDOT earlier in this meeting. The questions he was talking about are all of the local projects and the funding mechanisms. He said he has tried to be consistent over the years that his main concern has been that we know what the fiscal impact on the whole community will be—meaning what the fiscal impacts be beyond that of the road construction project itself. He wants to know all of the rollover impacts on the community—all of the different access roads, cuts, pedestrian bridges, all of the questions that were posed. What are they, how much will they cost and where INDOT will or will not pay for things? He has always said that he needs to know these things before he could vote to approve the TIP request? Ms. Flum said that information should be available. They have already had these conversations on a monthly basis with the participating agencies. Mr. Kruzan said he was referring to the questions coming from the Chamber meetings, BEDC, IU, etc. Ms. Flum encouraged the PC members who are represented by a participating agency to have a conversation with them. Ms. Kiesling said she would like to get that information before the 11th hour. She said she wouldn't vote for the amendment if she gets that information late. Ms. Flum said that all of these questions have been answered repeatedly at the meetings with the participating agencies.

Mr. Sabbagh said that before that point we certainly want SR37 made safer for all that traffic coming in here. The longer we put that decision off will frankly put the community at risk. As long as he has been involved, we have had the community complain about bicycle and pedestrian crossing of SR37. The City and the County aren't able to solve those problems. But, it seems to him, from what he reads here, indicates that INDOT will give us those improvements. It gives us bicycle crossings and pedestrian crossings which will result in a lot more safety which the community has been asking for a long period of time. He believes in the information super highway also. He thought it wouldn't be a lot of extra money to put in conduit when you dig up the highway from Indianapolis to Bloomington. He asked for more information about existing lines and who can use them. The private sector needs lots of band width. Put in the conduit and let some other private entity blow in the fiber. He wanted INDOT to consider that.

Mr. Ruff noted that, in addition to all the questionable I-69 related activities that have been thoroughly covered by the Indianapolis Star, even recently in the local paper, the H-T covered the potentially very problematic history of the approval of Section 4 of I-69. Apparently, both INDOT and FHWA knowingly agreed to conceal relevant air quality data that may well have affected or precluded the approval at least at that time of Section 4. The fact that the H-T actually was sympathetic and acknowledged and recognized the issues involved is a pretty strong statement that there likely are some real issues. He has seen many of the INDOT and FHWA documents that led to those articles that the H-T wrote. They are related to lawsuits that are being brought by state and local groups and that are moving right now through the legal system. These documents were mostly obtained through FOIA requests by these groups. It is entirely possible that this MPO approved a project to be put in our TIP that was out of compliance of federal law at the time. We never should have been put in that position and it may be that we never should have put it into our TIP. Since Section 4 will be tied to Section 5 it is entirely relevant to Section 5. It relates directly to the fundamental mission and responsibility of this MPO and the potential approval for any new projects. He will be seeking at the next meeting (or any meeting where something related to Section 5 comes forward) a detailed presentation at the meeting of that relevant information and a little bit about that history. It is a voluminous amount of material to say the least. He suggested forming a subcommittee to look over some of these materials in advance of the meeting. He has been assured that individuals who have spent hundreds of hours pouring through these documents that they would be able to assist us in narrowing things down more efficiently than if we did it without assistance. He proposed that the chair by executive action appoint a subcommittee of volunteer members. He asked that group to develop a strategy to begin to examine some of this information in advance of the meeting. Otherwise, he didn't think they could get a handle on all of this information at the next meeting. We may be able to narrow the detailed presentation down at the next meeting if the subcommittee can help.

Mr. Desmond said that the Committee Chair cannot create a subcommittee. The PC votes to create a subcommittee and empower it with certain things to accomplish as a group. Mr. Ruff asked if they needed to come up with the volunteers now. Mr. Desmond said he believed that volunteers were taken at the time. Mr. Ruff asked if they could do this via email voting procedure. Mr. Desmond said he would have to research that. Mr. Martin asked what material Mr. Ruff wanted the subcommittee to review is and how that material relates to the issue before the PC at the next meeting. Mr. Ruff said the inclusion of Section 4 which brings I-69 to Bloomington and leads to Section 5 which we are about to hear may have been approved under intentional concealment of critical relevant data that would have prevented it from coming to this committee at that time and is not resolved yet. To move forward on Section 5 without even taking the time for the PC to better understand what those documents show –the H-T’s articles barely touched on it but they did at least suggest that there was a concealment of data. He would be willing to spend hours at that meeting but as a PC member to present and have assistance in presenting all information that is deemed relevant. Mr. Martin asked Mr. Ruff how is it relevant to the question that is before the PC. Mr. Ruff said he didn’t know what the question concerning Section 5 would be at the next meeting. Mr. Martin said they would know what the question is because staff will present it to them as a TIP amendment with a dollar amount on it in a box. Mr. Martin said he was not willing to spend a lot of time looking at Section 4 issues at this point even if Section 4 shouldn’t have been done. He reminded the PC that he didn’t vote for the Section 4 construction project. But, it is in the TIP and whether or not any legal action gets taken—are you saying that we should be trying to engage in some kind of de-certification of the TIP? Mr. Ruff said that the subcommittee could perhaps decide that it is pretty obvious that Section 4 should be removed from the TIP. Mr. Martin thought that it might not do any good. Mr. Ruff asked why they should take action to continue to approve of throwing additional money at Section 5 when we have reason to believe that it could be stopped for an indefinite period of time until some of these issues are decided.

Mr. Martin said he believed that there are a lot of issues that we do need to address despite the statements by INDOT that they are trying to address all this stuff. We haven’t seen any of the things that actually do it. We have very little information from our participating agencies. They may be talking to them but that information is not filtering down to us. He understood that there may have been problems with the decision process for Section 4. He certainly understood that there are problems with the way things proceed in Section 4 given the way that contractors tend to do construction anyway. He didn’t know as a person asked to make a policy decision can effectively deal with that in the context of this body. He understands and shares many of Mr. Ruff’s concerns but doesn’t think that we have the authority to do that at this point in time. He would be interested in preventing these problems going forward. Mr. Ruff asked if Mr. Martin didn’t think that it would be very likely that we would (under any circumstances) be able to amend our TIP to take out what we approved in Section 4. Mr. Martin said he thought that the PC could amend the TIP and do that. The TIP has to be signed by the governor. The governor won’t sign that TIP. We could do it but it’s already in the TIP and it’s already in the State Transportation Plan so it’s a done deal. We have no way of forcing the State to accept our TIP. Mr. Ruff said that we don’t really know to this day what the governor can and can’t do in terms in terms of rejecting our new TIP, using an old TIP, of decertifying this MPO, etc. He asked staff if they had the Mission Statement of the MPO handy. He believed that we would be proceeding to do something that is in direct conflict with our mission as an MPO to protect the health and well-being of this community.

Mr. McDaniel said that the PC cannot take action on something that is not in the agenda. He suggested that Mr. Ruff and anyone else on the PC that wants to should investigate and make a statement at the next meeting.

Mr. Sabbagh said that it sounded to him that we want to filibuster. We are complaining about the people in Washington filibustering. We can’t stop Section 4 or the connection to SR 37. We need to protect the citizens of our community by working on Section 5. You are fighting yesterday’s fight. Let’s work on tomorrow’s issues and solve those.

Mr. Kruzan said that his concern was that they have a CAC that is speaking in a manner to give a blank check to INDOT. By the way, I have no problems with filibusters. I haven't complained about them. The biggest problem with what's being said today about this is to say that we are endangering people in this community is completely inaccurate. The State of Indiana and INDOT is endangering people in this community by having built a Section 4 without having approval of a Section 5 yet. It was done as a tactic. It was done as leverage and it is working. It has got people saying what they wanted us to say. That is a real problem. I hope that the CAC will really take a look at this and not reflect that philosophy at the next meeting because we will have negotiated away any of our bargaining chips if we take that approach. We shouldn't come into this saying, "The sky is falling," and we have to do this no matter what. Then, we will have no leverage at all. His biggest concern is to protect the community's long term interest. If we have by having Section 4 approved built pressure up on ourselves—which we have now done. That doesn't mean we have to give away the farm on Section 5. To say that we need to move forward and that this is a filibuster or a delay tactic means that we can't ask any questions. Because if we ask any questions somehow we are being painted as delaying which is exactly why I brought up my concern to INDOT this month and why I brought up the same concern for years. He wants to see the answers to the questions as to what the impact on this community is going to be, how much is it going to cost and who is going to pay it. Those are reasonable questions to ask and to know the answers to in advance. If we don't know the answers then we don't vote for it. We don't think of ourselves as somehow endangering the public or engaging in unnecessary delays.

Mr. Martin said the real lesson for us from Section 4 is that our responsibility for due diligence in these policy questions is much more difficult and much greater than we ever would have anticipated. There were so many unanswered questions and those unanswered questions are still current questions going forward. Now we know better what questions to ask and what responses to expect. So far we have been asking a lot of questions but we still are not getting very good answers. Until we get solid answers that deal with this community's capabilities to move forward and meet its obligations to its residents, I don't see how we can approve anything. We have to have the answers first—not afterwards. We have to know what we are accepting when we accept something. We didn't know in Section 4. We will know in Section 5.

Ms. Allen added that she had been at all of the participating agency meetings except 1. There have been a lot of really good discussions that have come out of those meetings. I think you all need to make sure that you are talking with those folks that are at those meetings. I think a lot of these questions and a lot of project changes have come from those meetings. The idea behind those was so that we wouldn't get to a point where it felt like there were unanswered questions. Those meetings happened every month so that we could know what the community's questions were and answer those. INDOT's done a good job. Ms. Hamman has done a good job. She suggested that Mr. Martin reach out to the participating agencies. I hope that happens before the next meeting.

Ms. Kiesling said we need documentation. We can all talk but talk isn't the final answer. We would like to see it in writing.

Mr. Martin said it is not us reaching out. We are the ones who make the decisions. If people want the decisions made they have to be coming to us. We don't know who to contact.

Mr. Kruzan said that we had a lot of debate with INDOT about the Bypass which was done incredibly professionally and has exceeded expectations. I also know and this is extremely minor in the grand scheme of things but it's symbolic of his concern. Of plans that he and his predecessor had signed off on, there were plans for a pedestrian bridge that was to go over the Bypass. The plans were in writing and signed. But, the bridge just went away. The plans were in a signed agreement between the State of Indiana and the City of Bloomington. The same was done on this plan with the pedestrian crossing at Dunn and the Bypass. It was built without it



with no heads up or discussion. He believed it was the right decision but there was no communication. It is completely contrary to what the written agreement was. An explanation was given after the fact but had we disagreed on it, the road was already built. The same has been true of the truck traffic on the Section 4 construction where certain roads were not going to be used, assurances were given and those roads are being used. There is a credibility concern that we have, too. I do know that what has been said in the participating agency meetings and at the Chamber meetings. A lot of progress has been made since the beginning. It is why Wapehani is moving forward. Every question we asked was answered and it allowed us to move forward and I think it is exactly as it was described. We just have to work out the final details. So, if all that kind of pattern follows on all the other points, I think it's fair to be asking for a vote at the next meeting.

Ms. Munson said that as a new member on PC, she finds it very difficult to identify all the participating agencies and all of the various meetings that have taken place regarding Section 5. Is there going to be a written report made available to the MPO PC members prior to the next meeting?

Mr. Martin said the MPO is composed of local planning agencies of which 3 of the participating agencies in the I-69 activity constitute part of that body. They are participating in the I-69 Section 5 activity independent of the MPO. They are members of the MPO but their participation in that activity is independent of any responsibilities to the MPO. They are not obligated to report to the MPO. That is an agreement between those planning authorities and the State of Indiana—not between the MPO and the State of Indiana.

Mr. Ruff commented that the INDOT representatives who offered that several changes have been made so far in the project in response to citizen input. He would like very much if he could be provided with a list of those specific changes (not on paper or plans) but on the ground implemented changes in the project as it has been built so far as a result of citizen input. Then, along side that a list of changes that were made without any public involvement—For example, roads that have been cut that were not supposed to be cut off. He reminded everyone that over \$900 million have been spent so far on Sections 1, 2, and 3. \$700 million of that was a one-time windfall from the lease of the Toll Road. That was Major Moves money. It's not even listed where the funds will come from to construct Sections 5 and 6. Section 4 is supposed to be funded with traditional funding. That windfall of money that was there to get this thing started presumably provided some ability to have some kind of enhancements. The rest of the project—if funded at all—is going to be extremely difficult to build. It's just not very believable that it is going to play out that way. There will be nothing to build the rest.

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

A. Topic Suggestions for Future Agendas

IX. Upcoming Meetings

A. Technical Advisory Committee – March 27, 2013 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)

B. Citizens Advisory Committee – March 27, 2013 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)

C. Policy Committee – April 12, 2013 at 1:30 p.m. (Council Chambers)

Adjournment

**Action Requested / Public comment prior to vote (limited to five minutes per speaker)*

3/8/13 Policy Committee Minutes approved at April 12 meeting (JFW)