



Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
April 12, 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), Lynn Coyne (IU Real Estate), 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), Dan Swafford (Town of Ellettsville), Rick Marquis (FHWA), and Bill Williams (County Highway).

Others: Sandra Flum (INDOT), Michelle Allen (FHWA), David Baker (Michael Baker), Lisa Manning (Michael Baker), Vicky Sorenson (Indian Creek Township), Dan Moore (Home Bank, Martinsville), Jeff Milzer (Hoosier Voices for I-69), Liz Irwin (Bloomington Chamber), Jim Shelton (Bloomington Chamber), Larry Jacobs (Bloomington Chamber), Darby McCarty (Smithville Communications), David Pluckelbaum (Corradino), Bren George (FHWA), Matt Norris (Monroe Co. resident), David Norris (Monroe Co. resident), Scott Wells (Environmental Enterprises), Thea Linnemeier (Monroe Co. resident), Doc Ernst (Co. resident), Mitch Holland (Co. resident), Cary Chambers (IU Health Blgtn), Christy Gillenwater (SW IN Chamber), Peggy Mayfield (State Representative), Nikki Johnson (CFC), Andy Williams (Rogers Group), Ron Walker (BEDC), Karen Bobo (FHWA), Tom Orman (Cowden Enterprises), Vicky Sorenson (Indiana Creek Township Trustee), Clark Sorensen (Citizen Taxpayer), Thomas Tokarski (CARR), Jay DuMontelle, and Lucille Bertuccio.

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

- I. **Call to Order** – Mr. McDaniel called the meeting to order. He noted that this is Mr. Coyne’s last meeting since he is retiring from Indiana University. He explained the rules for public comment. Pro and Con speakers will sign up to speak and alternate turns. Everyone who wants to speak will get a chance. The Committee members introduced themselves.
- II. **Approval of Minutes:**
 - A. **March 8, 2013**—Mr. McDaniel made a correction to the minutes. *****Mr. Sabbagh moved approval of the minutes. Mr. Martin seconded. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.**
- III. **Communications from the Chair** – Mr. McDaniel noted that public transportation has been funded by the State at \$42.6 million per year for the past 5 years. The current budget bill recommends continuing that amount for the next 2 years. Recently there was an attempt in the Senate to strip the public transportation funds to use for Governor Pence’s income tax cuts. Luckily that did not happen but it still has to survive conference committee. He discussed House Bill 1011.
- IV. **Reports from Officers and/or Committees**
 - A. **Citizens Advisory Committee**—Mr. Sabbagh said that the CAC passed a resolution after much discussion.
 - B. **Technical Advisory Committee**—Mr. Reid said that the TAC recommendation was in favor of adoption of the INDOT project into the TIP. (There was one abstention.)

V. Reports from the MPO Staff

A. MTP Task Force—Mr. Desmond reported that work is continuing on the Demand Model via the responses from the travel survey which is still available for the public to participate in online. The initial public input phase is complete. We had 2 public meeting and 6 stakeholder interviews.

B. TIP Administrative Modification—Ms. Dragovich reported that INDOT had submitted a TIP administrative modification for the bridge deck overlay over Stephen’s Creek along SR 46. There were no objections so the MPO Director and the Policy Committee Chair signed the resolution moving the funds from the 2013 to the 2014 TIP. Mr. Martin noted that the request arrived without any explanation. It took about 3 days to get an explanation out of INDOT as to why they wanted to move it. It was simply a matter of timing. He suggested that INDOT include very clear information with their requests to make the process smoother.

C. Draft FY 2014-2017 TIP Projects—Mr. Desmond said that we are working on a new TIP for the FY 2014-2017 (Mr. Reid had reported that the TAC had some preliminary discussions of possible projects.) We have been able to work with all of our LPAs and balance requested funding. Staff plans to bring a full draft document in May. We will request final action on June 14. Ms. Kiesling asked for frequent updates as details change. Mr. Martin asked why national and state funding information are not included in the funding tables. Is that because they are not local? Mr. Desmond said they are not included in these tables because these tables are specifically local expenditures. These are expenditures that we are specifically on the hook for. Mr. Martin noted that the projects are, however, in our TIP. Mr. Martin requested the addition of another table so that when we are looking at this we will know that there are funds embedded in our TIP that are not reflected in these tables. Ms. Munson asked Mr. Desmond if projects could be identified as old or new in the next tables.

VI. Old Business

A. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment

i. Statewide Fracture Critical Bridge Inspections (INDOT)*

Mr. Gallagher said that the bridge division folks in Indianapolis had a meeting with FHWA and decided that this particular item is not needed for the Bloomington MPO TIP since there are no fracture critical bridges within the boundaries of the Bloomington MPO. Mr. Gallagher withdrew the amendment.

VII. New Business

A. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment

i. Section 5, Interstate 69 (INDOT)*

Ms. Dragovich introduced the TIP amendment submitted by INDOT to include Section 5 of I-69 into TIP. This includes only the section that falls within our Metropolitan Planning Area. This segment will run from Victor Pike to Kinser Pike. INDOT estimates that in FY 2013 – 2015 the cost will be approximately \$77.7 million. Beyond those years it will be \$82,900.00. We had a 30-day public comment period. TAC recommended approval of the amendment. CAC recommended withholding approval pending resolution of several issues detailed in their March 27 resolution.

Sandra Flum of INDOT presented the TIP amendment. The project is an upgrade of 21 miles of SR 37 to I-69. It begins north of Victor Pike on the south side of Bloomington and continues to just south of SR 39 in Martinsville. It converts a partial access controlled state road to a fully access controlled interstate. It follows the alignment of SR 37.

INDOT presented Preferred Alternative 8 from Tier 2 Draft Environmental Statement. It includes overpasses at Rockport Rd., interchanges at Fullerton, Tapp and 2nd St., interchange at 3rd St., overpass at Vernal Pike, interchange at SR 46 and an overpass at Arlington Rd. Currently you have interchanges at 2nd St., 3rd St., and SR 46. In the more rural area, you have an overpass at Kinser Pike, FHWA has approved an existing partial interchange at Walnut St. and a new interchange at Sample Rd. (with local access roads), an overpass at Chambers Pike and an interchange at Liberty Church Rd. She gave a synopsis of the work that has been done in the last 18 months to meet with as many people as possible in order to answer questions and provide information on Section 5. Due to feedback, Section 5 has been improved in many ways. Every overpass and interchange has planned bicycle and pedestrian facilities that meet local standards. INDOT has agreed to an aesthetic allowance and to continue to coordinate on other local projects other than I-69. INDOT has committed to \$13 million of improvements including the wider bridge decks. INDOT has provided what was requested by the CAC. Improvements for local INDOT projects other than I-69 are included. With the Policy Committee's vote on this TIP amendment, INDOT is ready to make requested safety improvements on SR 37. Safety improvements to SR 37 were requested by various members of the community to prepare for the opening of I-69 Section 4. INDOT is committed to providing safety improvements before Section 4 is open to traffic. Safety priorities include removing at-grade crossings such as the one at Vernal Pike through the urban area. The Policy Committee helps INDOT fulfill their promises to improve safety improvements to our roads by voting to include Section 5 in the TIP today. You have stated your concern that you will put something in the TIP but INDOT will disappear and never talk to you again. Ms. Flum said that she hopes that INDOT's history over the past 15-18 months of community dialogue and their fulfillment of promises will show the MPO that INDOT is not going away. INDOT requests that when the NEPA process and the EISs are over, the LPAs will kind of lose their status, INDOT wants to continue to work with the MPO's technical staff throughout the rest of the process. INDOT is exploring innovative ways to deliver needed safety improvements for the citizens of Bloomington while reducing uncertainty and inconvenience for motorists and businesses. We would like to deliver this quickly and it requires an aggressive schedule. INDOT will select a Technical Procurement Advisor in the next 10 days. That firm will help us write specifications for the contracts that we will let in Section 5. INDOT is prepared to begin right-of-way services once the MPO authorizes the use of federal funds. She presented a schedule for Schedule 5: RFI (Dec 2012), RFP for technical services (Apr 2013), TIP amendment (April 2013), RFQ for innovative delivery (May 2013), Draft RFP (May 2013 includes safety/project sequence), FEIS/ROD (June 2013), RFP – July 2013), Select preferred proposer (Nov 2013). Ms. Flum asked for the Policy Committee to include Section 5 in the BMCMPPO TIP. The reasons listed are that I-69 is a regionally significant project in the state and local plans. It delivers requested safety improvements. It reduces uncertainty for affected property owners since right-of-way funding cannot be expended in the MPO area without TIP approval. I-69 will improve traffic management and INDOT will continue to request Section 5 inclusion in the BMCMPPO TIP.

Mr. Ruff said that he had a letter from the Bloomington Chamber of Commerce that states in the second paragraph, "Interstate traffic will be brought to Bloomington by the end of 2014." But, he was recently given an INDOT press release dated April 12, 2013 saying that there is a 3-mile section in southeastern Greene County that it is a difficult area to build on and is projected to be open in 2015. He was wondering if the opening date is 2014 or 2015. Ms. Flum said that the contracts that were let in Monroe County are scheduled to be open in 2014. There is this one section that we provided alternate bids and the bid came in for 2015 however there are incentives to get the section open earlier. We will still be working toward a 2014 opening recognizing that at least part of the project will be open in 2014. Mr. Ruff said that his second question also comes from the letter from the Bloomington Chamber of Commerce stating that interstate traffic will be brought to Bloomington by the end of 2014. And yet we have recently learned that Tennessee simply shelved their I-69 segment plans. That is confirmed. Kentucky is doing nothing except doing some improvements to their existing toll road in that part of the

state. There is no plan or funding for an I-69 bridge over the Ohio River for this route. We are told that the needs are based on interstate traffic. Where is this traffic going to be coming from? There is no foreseeable plan in the works for this to be extended beyond this southwestern Indiana segment. Ms. Flum said it is extended to Evansville at this point. We have the interstate traffic on the 67 miles open, the Evansville traffic and traffic from the Kentucky parkway. The Kentucky parkway system is near interstate and FHWA and Kentucky are working together to upgrade their parkway system. The US 41 bridge connects to the parkway (she believes). There is a connection and the interstate is open in southern Indiana so that is interstate traffic coming up. Mr. Ruff said he would argue that more traffic comes across the new 231 bridge possibly. There's not going to be an I-69 bridge. That was part of the original plan. The original plan calls for an I-69 bridge crossing over the Ohio River. Did you say that they are going to use the US 41 bridge? Ms. Flum said she misspoke if that is what Mr. Ruff heard. Currently there is the US 41 bridge that brings Kentucky traffic into Indiana. The plans for an I-69 bridge over the Ohio were developed as part of a draft environmental statement and they have not been furthered but we plan to continue those when we finish the current projects that we are working on. Mr. Ruff said what he was getting at is that the US 41 bridge and the 231 bridge exist—the traffic using it exists. The traffic coming this direction exists. (Mr. Ruff had staff display a report from the Ft. Wayne Sentinel.) This report was from early in the project. Tennessee and Kentucky don't have the money to build their part. The bridge is not going to be built. Indiana would be in the same situation except that our former governor sold the toll road for several billion dollars—but that money is all gone now. INDOT says it is for interstate traffic but that is existing interstate traffic. It's using the US 41 bridge and it is connected now. Where is the dramatic influx of traffic coming from? You talked about interstate traffic—not intrastate traffic. Ms. Flum said this project was developed for traffic from other states but INDOT can't speak for what other states do. Mr. Ruff said that this project was supposedly developed with input from all these interests along the entire route. He quoted Mr. Daniels just before his election saying that they didn't have a final route because they didn't have the funding. Daniels said that Indiana had several major transportation projects on the book that all need funds. If we take the most expensive version of I-69 we may not have money for anything else, Daniels said. O'Bannon may have had the best idea but he said he wasn't persuaded yet. Mr. Ruff said that was Daniels recognizing that there was no funding them. Gas tax revenues had been declining. The funding situation in the future would be worse than they were then. Now the Major Moves funding is all gone. What is the plan to pay for I-69 other than some private investors chomping at the bit to fund I-69 from Indianapolis to Bloomington? Ms. Flum said they plan to use private industry getting together with their engineers, their contractors, financiers and, perhaps, maintenance people to put together a team including the financing. They bid to do the work and to deliver the project. INDOT in return makes milestone payments out of our existing gas tax collections (federal and state) when the work is being completed. Mr. Ruff said he assumed the payments would be larger since interest would be included. It would be a speculative financing venture by private interests, right? Ms. Flum said they have demonstrated in the TIP (which is fiscally constrained) it would be \$20 million per year for 3 years of the TIP. Mr. Ruff asked if that is what INDOT considers fiscally constrained. INDOT expects to be able to pay this back with declining gas tax revenues in the future.

Mr. McDaniel asked Mr. Ruff if Mr. Stark could make comments. Mr. Stark said that Tennessee has recanted and they are back planning to build I-69. They just made that decision. Mr. Ruff asked Mr. Stark to forward the decision to him to review. Mr. Stark said they worked with Kentucky to procure 2 new Ohio River bridges this year. They are currently studying a bridge at Henderson. They are currently in the middle of 3 different types of procurements over the Ohio—with other states. It is more of a case of prioritizing when that will come and when it will happen. It's not been shelved. It is still in the planning stages. He wanted to make sure that the PC understood that. A P3 procurement—a public/private procurement—is just another tool for INDOT to use. It is a tool that allows us to not have to wait until we do have an accumulation of a lot of different funds in the future. We can procure it all at

one time work with the private sector and the payments are made from our appropriations in the future but we just went through one of our most successful bids in the history of the P3 realm with the procurement for the Ohio River bridge just last year. It is a very successful way to get a project built. That project cost almost a billion dollars. This is a much smaller amount of money. We have had such interest from the private sector. We had 17 answers to our RFI. We have had companies that are very interested in partnering with our local contractors to be prepared to bid on this project. We have done our due diligence. It is the right thing to do for the state. It is the best way to manage our funds and our money. Every part of our finance division has reviewed this. They are ready to go. It is just another way to procure. It is non-traditional. It is new to the US. It has been done in Europe and Canada successfully for years. It is borrowed money and there are payments to be made. It allows us to get everything done today.

Mr. Ruff said he would like a list of actual completed, recent projects that have been done this way. It just seemed to him that there has got to be some form of assurance in order (given the projected economy and gas tax revenues) for the private company to be sure to get their money. It has got to be something like tolls. Will tolls be used as assurance of payment? Mr. Stark said the bridges are tolled but Section 5 will not be tolled. Mr. Ruff said the state needs the tolls to pay for the construction. Mr. Stark said that if INDOT did not have the funds the Indiana Finance Authority (the procuring agent for these funds) has the authority to get appropriations from our government to make payments if necessary. This is written in our contracts. This gives assurance that the money is there. Mr. Ruff said that he did not believe that INDOT has the funds. Projects have been cancelled and delayed all across the state. The Cline Ave. bridge in Lake County has been closed and INDOT refused to build a new bridge. Instead they hired a private company to build a new toll-funded bridge. Many county roads have been returned to gravel due to a lack of funds for paving. He asked Mr. Stark if gas tax revenues are declining. Mr. Stark said yes. That is why Congress is looking for additional methods of funding. Mr. Ruff thanked Mr. Stark for responding to his questions.

Mr. Baker asked Mr. Stark about the April 11 document. He asked for clarification about the projects mentioned on the bottom of page 3. "Requested projects are considered to be separate projects from the I-69 Section 5 project." I believe you are talking about all the projects discussed in the above document. He said he was asking since it is so close to the "Aesthetics." You are talking about all of the projects in the document, are you not? Ms. Flum said Mr. Baker was right. That is referencing the priority projects that your resolution from the CAC talked about. Mr. Baker said it appears to be a partial step forward from the last round of negotiations. We are talking about assigning a project manager to begin work and so on, there are some time periods defined and so on—he asked INDOT to define what "partner" means. Does partnering include bringing new money in? Are you talking about reallocating monies that are already in our TIP? Or is INDOT talking about bringing money in from the outside of this TIP and adding to these projects? They are at the point where some of us need to see dollar signs. Mr. Baker said that first he would like to know the definition of the word "partner." Mr. Stark said it would be monies over and above your normally allocated funds that are set aside for the MPO. INDOT would find ways to fund with FHWA, etc. in order to get these projects built. Mr. Baker said he was going to have to hear either dollar or percentage values to really get further along. He was wondering whether it would even be possible to talk about actual dollar values. We have some estimates. For example, we have a \$10,000,000 estimate for 17th St. Is there any way that we can come to numbers on that project so that we would really know what portion INDOT would put in? What the portion would be from the City/County? Is that something that INDOT can work on and get back to us on? Mr. Stark said that was why they put down that we felt that with all 3 of these projects that within a 5-month period we would have all of that information worked out as to what percentage the City or County would have available to put into these projects and what percentage INDOT would be partnering with everyone to get these projects funded. That is what the commitment says. Mr. Martin said that the number is between \$30 and

\$35 million in extra funding for these projects that are sitting here. He asked Mr. Stark if he was saying that over the course of the next 2-3 years INDOT is going to contribute another \$30-\$35 million to projects that are devoted to remediating the traffic situations that are going to be created in this community as a result of I-69. Mr. Stark said he was not sure what the numbers are. He thought that there were 3 projects that were on the letter that was listed. He was not sure exactly when those projects need to be improved. They may not need to be improved until later –perhaps in 10 years. The commitment is there that INDOT will work with the City and the County and establish a way to get these projects funded. That is their commitment. Mr. Martin asked who makes the determination about when it's needed. Mr. Stark said they would need to work with City/County engineers and planning people and work with traffic studies and impacts that will be decided. We feel that within that 5-month period we should be able to come to a conclusion. Mr. Martin said that Mr. Stark was saying that at that point in time would be the point in which I should be thinking about a policy decision concerning INDOT activities. Is that correct? Mr. Stark asked Mr. Martin if he was talking about a policy decision about I-69 Section 5 activities. Mr. Martin said yes. He didn't see these as separate activities. He understood that Mr. Stark does but Mr. Martin doesn't. From a policy perspective in this community these are all bound together. They cannot be separated. It has always been the case that the impact of I-69 is not limited to the concrete corridor for which INDOT is responsible. There are impacts for which we have to make policy decisions. Mr. Stark said that he totally agreed. Mr. Martin said when we make a policy decision we have to consider all of the impacts not just the part that is of concern to you. I want to be able to resolve those policy issues that affect our community as part of his policy decision about INDOT's request. Those issues are bound together so tightly and the impacts so pervasive that he sees no way to separate them.

Mr. Kruzan said that Governor Daniels floated the idea of toll roads and later rescinded that and stated there would not be tolling. Morgan County had the foresight to have their legislative team in law ban tolling in Morgan County. In theory, tolling would have to begin at the Monroe County line. Mr. Stark has said that there will not be toll roads. Has Governor Pence said there will not be any toll roads? Mr. Stark did not know. Ms. Flum said in order to toll a facility the Environmental Study has to include aspects of tolling as part of the study. They have not been included in this Environmental Study. Mr. Kruzan said he would like to hear if the governor is for tolling or not. The Chamber driven meetings have come up with a list of 3 projects. There are others who have priorities outside of the 3 that were talked about at the Chamber meetings. The list outside of what we have been talking about includes—we've already talked about 17th St. which is about \$8 million—Liberty Drive extension has not been talked about is about \$5 million, Weimer Rd. reconstruction is about \$7 million—those are projects that weren't included in the list of 3. Without being disrespectful, why would a policy board give up its opportunity to be leveraging dollars for all the spinoff impact of this project up front? If you were in our position, why wouldn't you be waiting until you had dollar commitments made to give approval? Mr. Kruzan said he had plenty of reasons to vote for it. He said he told Richard and Jack this morning that he believes that INDOT has come much further along in commitments than he had believed would happen. He really appreciates it. They've come along on aesthetics, on 2nd and 3rd St. They have committed many millions of dollars that were not there the last time that we met in this forum. That is the good news. On the other hand there are all these other projects that we are concerned about the local community having to pick up that are unfunded at this point. Some PC members believe that if we vote to approve Section 5, what is the incentive for INDOT to listen? Mr. Kruzan said he understood about being good stewards of public monies. But, why wouldn't you move on to the next section and seek approval there. How do we have leverage at that point to talk about these issues? Why wouldn't we wait to vote until we know what the dollar commitment is?

Mr. Stark said we feel that to fall in line with our schedule of when Section 4 will be completed and when it will be open that we need to start our procurement process now. We need to be buying right-of-

way now. Because without having the right-of-way we can't do a lot of what needs to be done. We can't use federal funds. We can't even buy right-of-way with our own funds without it in the TIP. We need the approval of this TIP amendment now. That is a key to getting the procurement started and get things under construction. He understood where the PC is coming from. Someone made a statement at the last Chamber meeting that INDOT said what they were going to do and have actually done everything that they said they were going to do. He knows that there is a lot of history between INDOT and Bloomington that is not good. He gave the example that they said what they were going to do on the Bypass project and did everything we said we were going to do. He said he has the authority to make these statements to the PC but he is also knows (from the private sector and business) that unless he knows exactly what that scope is and when it needs to be built---There are roads that we study and plan on doing things and we get to the point of doing things---things may change. Projects may need to be accelerated or maybe not done for 20 years. If we wait another 5 or 6 months, it will push out the procurement process, it will delay the safety improvements. We won't delay what's going on in Section 4 because that's on a track. That's why we're asking now.

Mr. Kruzan noted that both Ms. Flum and Mr. Stark keep referring to the 3 projects that you are working on. He wanted to make clear that they aren't limiting the projects to 3. Mr. Stark said they answered the resolution. Mr. Kruzan said we very carefully made sure we didn't paint ourselves into a corner. From the Chamber meetings and from the resolution you have the 3 projects but there are other priorities that are not part of those 3. He asked Mr. Stark if INDOT is limiting your consideration to those 3. Mr. Stark said that they were not. Mr. Kruzan said that he appreciated it.

Ms. Munson asked how long it would take INDOT and local government officials to figure out what the costs are and what the commitment may need to be. Mr. Stark said they thought they could have the information together on the 3 projects within 5 months. There are certain projects listed that may not have even had environmental work done yet. Until the environmental studies are done it is very difficult to figure the costs because you don't know what the impacts are. Environmental studies take much longer than 5 months. They would need the City and County engineers to work with INDOT to make those determinations. Ms. Munson said the County has a list of estimated project costs on County projects. They range from a small project (a turnaround at Acuff Rd.) that would be needed immediately. A more involved project is Gates Dr. and Industrial Dr. That estimated cost is about \$8 million. The connectivity that is very much needed for Ellettsville for people to travel north to Martinsville and Indianapolis involves improvements of Bales and Sample Roads to allow people to reach the interchange at Sample Road and I-69. The cost of those two is \$11.5 million. Mr. Williams has already done some preliminary work. Do you really think that 5 months is required to work out agreements on specific projects where there has already been preliminary work? Ms. Flum said that she has talked to Bill about the list of projects that he has. Gates Drive is a perfect example. Right now on Gates Drive there was one place where it was planned to have a railroad crossing maybe 10 years ago. She thought that the estimates came from that location. If we sit down in a cooperative way, we can look at the scope of that project to assess if that is the right place for it or is there some place that is better suited to serve the populations that you are trying to serve. Ellettsville is interested in the Gates Drive area. So scoping it as well as putting a schedule together and then putting a financial cost to it. Especially doing multiple projects at once will take 5 months to accomplish. Ms. Munson said she would question the need to rush into a decision prior to having the agreements that 5 months might bring down the road. INDOT announced that they were going to have a delay in Section 4 construction. Ms. Flum said the delay is contract that will be done in 2015 unless they have favorable weather and are able to accelerate that. That does not stop INDOT from opening Section 4 from the county line to Bloomington. There will be some of Section 4 open. Ms. Munson asked about opening the road from the county line to Bloomington. Ms. Flum said there are 2 interchanges that are not part of the part

scheduled for 2015. Ms. Munson said we won't have very much traffic without completion of that problem area in Greene County.

Ms. Kiesling thanked the chairman, Mr. Stark and staff for coming forth with the information that we have in the time we have requested. She thought that they have made a lot of headway on it. The scary part for most of us is that here comes this road and suddenly we have major potential costs that we have no way of providing and our citizens are going to be stuck somewhere. They won't be able to get from one place to the other or get the public safety that we need. She just got a letter from Perry Clear Creek and they are concerned about how they are going to provide services. Those are the things I want to put on the record here. She appreciates all that has been done and we need to continue to talk about things. She wanted to know what INDOT means by partnering. Bill wants to know that, too. She didn't know whether it makes sense to approve this today. She wanted to know what they will do tomorrow if you get that and what if they don't, what's the next step.

Mr. Stark said if the TIP is approved today they continue with the plans of getting the procurement started and start right-of-way acquisition. Ms. Kiesling asked why they couldn't do any of that without the TIP approval. Mr. Stark said to start the procurement they need the ROD to be signed. Mr. Stark said the ROD would come in June. When we do open certain parts of Section 4 to Bloomington there will be an increased ability for the traffic to get here. People are driving through Bloomington to take the Crane interchange to go to Evansville now. We know that is taking place. Mr. Stark said that Ms. Kiesling brings up a very good point. We are concerned about getting the improvements done to the Urbanized Area of Bloomington soon so that there is not a safety concern in the community. To do so our timing to get this procurement started and getting going now is important to INDOT. Ms. Flum said the some of the procurement activities (internal activities) that they need to do can be done prior to the ROD. It allows us to move ahead with procurement as soon as the ROD is signed. If the TIP amendment isn't gotten today, we don't have your commitment that you want those safety improvements. Ms. Kiesling said both sides need predictability.

Mr. Sabbagh said if we don't approve Section 5 today then these commitments that the community is asking for are not going happen. I presume those commitments are not going to happen until there is a commitment on Section 5. Is it a chicken and egg thing? Mr. Stark said that an MPO is supposed to work with the FHWA's Three Cs. If there is no commitment of the TIP that we are asking to be amended, there is no need for an improvement on a road. INDOT's goal is to build this regionally significant road which has been in the planning stages for years but it happening now. They were committed to work with the MPO. Mr. Sabbagh asked what would happen to the bike and ped crossings even over SR 37. He presumed they wouldn't happen if this project doesn't go forward. Ms. Flum said they need a ROD to do those projects. It is part of Section 5.

Mr. Ruff said that the issues in Bloomington and Monroe County to him result from the whole project. The impacts here are impacts from the whole project. He said he was discussing the whole project. It is our duty as an MPO to look out for the interests of our community here. Borrowing against future shrinking revenue streams is not a good idea or policy. INDOT has no other choice now to be able to claim that this is fiscally constrained and continue to rush forward on this project. It will become more and more apparent as time goes on that this wasn't a wise investment. He certainly appreciates the commitments of INDOT and he has no reason at all to believe that you are not totally sincere in the idea of making the commitments, working together and collaborating with the communities. He believes that they are 100% sincere. What do commitments that cost money really mean when money is clearly not there? He read a couple of quotes from the Indianapolis Business Journal. Representative Jeff Espich who was chairman of the House Finance Committee said, "No money has been allocated to complete

the most expensive and politically most sensitive busy stretch of I-69 from Indianapolis to Bloomington and existing revenue sources are tapped out. The \$3.8 billion of Major Moves funds from the toll road lease is all spent or allocated, gas tax collections are falling, a tax hike is politically difficult, federal earmarks have dried up and there is little money to shift from other projects.” Espich also said, “There is no money to finish anything of consequence much beyond routine maintenance and a few minor projects.” Former Governor Daniels acknowledged in an exclusive interview with the Indianapolis Star that times are tough and he’d be okay if the incoming governor decides to put the I-69 on hold. This idea that Bloomington will be getting anything in the way of aesthetic amenities or even significant alternative transportation amenities seems so speculative. He asked Mr. Stark to comment on Espich’s comments and what will happen if there are no takers on this 3P funding. Mr. Stark said when Rep. Espich made those comments he was probably making correct statements. The toll road funds were all committed and none were left for I-69. However, as we speak both the Senate and the House in Indiana are looking for appropriating other funds—not part of the gas tax funds—for Major Moves type projects. There has been talk of \$200 million a year for this biennium. But, those decisions haven’t been made yet. That was Espich’s comment last fall and now our legislature is looking at that. Mr. Ruff wanted to clarify that there is serious discussion right now about the diversion of other types of funds into transportation projects in the state because that is the only way that we are going to be able to do them. Mr. Stark said these would be coming out of the General Fund. That has been in the Indianapolis Star.

Mr. Baker said he appreciated the work that Mr. Stark and his team have done and feels like we’ve come some distance from where we were some months ago. His dilemma was that promising things and figuring out what they will cost later is counterintuitive. We can’t get a handle on how much money this is going to be. That would not work with our personal home dealings and here we are trying to apply it to the whole community. That gives him pause. There has to be an awful lot of trust to allow somebody to do that. What would INDOT think if we postpone the vote? Would you stay and discuss or pull out and say all agreements are null and void? Mr. Stark said they have been building an interstate for the last 4 year and they are bringing it to SR 37 on the south side of Bloomington. It is their intention to get this section built. It is your decision of when you want to get those safety improvements done.

Mr. Williams asked if INDOT could expedite the scope and study a little bit sooner than 5 months. The community has concern about these projects and information sooner might help. Mr. Stark said some may happen faster. They don’t plan to take 5 months absolutely. They wanted to set an end date. Mr. Williams said that 2 of the 3 projects (and possibly more) have been in the plan for over a decade. As Mr. Baker mentioned that by the next meeting we could have some of this hammered out.

*****Ms. Kiesling moved that public speaking time should be reduced to 3 minutes. A lot of these folks have spoken before so we know where they are coming from. She also hoped that some of them could consolidate what they are saying. Mr. Williams seconded the motion.**

Mr. McDaniel asked if there was any opposition to that or shall we vote on it. Mr. Ruff called for the vote.

*****Roll call vote was taken. Yes votes: Lynn Coyne, Susie Johnson, Mark Kruzan, Kent McDaniel, Dan Swafford, David Sabbagh, Bill Williams, Ryan Gallagher. No votes: Jack Baker, Richard Martin, Andy Ruff, Cheryl Munson. The motion passed by a vote of 8:4.**

Public Comment:

Clark Sorensen said that he lives in the I-69 War Zone formally known as Indian Creek Township. There was an article in the newspaper about the helicopter flight over the route from Crane to Bloomington. In the article, someone was quoted as saying that they could not see any pollution from the helicopter. That was interesting especially since it hadn't rained for several days. After it rains Indian Creek is brown with the sediment from the construction project. Also, Mayor Kruzan must not realize that Indiana is famous for growing trees. He made the comment, "Game over," due to the swath that has been cut through their trees in Indian Creek Township. In 15 or 30 years, the trees would grow back and you'd hardly know other than the rip rap around the karst features that they have not-so-carefully marked. He asked the PC to vote No. There isn't any hurry especially with the delay that has been announced in Section 4 in Greene County. Ms. Flum said that there would still be some utility in Monroe County in Section 4. That is not true. You would be able to get on to Section 4 at SR 37 and get off in Little Cincinnati. There is no access to Section 4 in Monroe County. He would like to table the motion until you have more information about the cost of these projects.

Dan Moore of Home Bank in Martinsville spoke in favor of the motion. They formed a Blue Ribbon Committee several years ago as a result of the devastating floods in 2008. They lost their largest employer and now have suffered the worst recession since 1930. Martinsville has not recovered as a community. They look at I-69 as an asset. How we can leverage that asset is up to them. They have been having congenial dialogues with INDOT all along. They have a poverty problem. Half of their children are on subsidized lunch programs. Martinsville is waiting for the opportunity to get it right. They believe that they can couple the expanded Indianapolis airport with I-69 to provide job opportunities. They have learned a lot from the PC's dialogue. They would like to work with Bloomington and I-69 may be a step in the right direction. He asked for the PC to move forward quickly.

Tom Tokarski with Citizen's for Appropriate Rural Roads said that his comments may sound harsh but he promised the PC that they are truthful. They are based on nearly 25 years of experience with INDOT and I-69. They are based on actual experiences not just promises at meetings. I-69 is the worst environmental disaster in Indiana in the last 50 years. If a tornado came through this area and did the damage that this highway has already done, it would be considered a national tragedy and yet we call it progress. If that is what it takes to have progress then there is no hope for this state. Some mitigation sites are located next to the highway. One site is an abandoned, seriously contaminated hog farm and a junk yard. Indiana to its detriment cares little about environmental quality. If INDOT and FHWA had to follow established laws and normal rules and regulations, I-69 would never have gotten beyond the first feasibility study. I-69 is a highway built on deceit and politics and not transportation need. I-69 is beyond normal regulatory oversight. CARR is prepared to make an in-depth, detailed presentation to the MPO on massive cover-ups involving the Clear Air Act, cover-up of an alternate route within Section 4 that would have saved the State tens of millions of dollars and avoided numerous karst features. INDOT paid over \$60,000 for the study and then buried it because (according to one INDOT official) it might have delayed the project. They would like to give the MPO an on-the-ground tour of the devastated route of I-69. There are on-going violations of Rule 5 dealing with erosion control that we have exposed. The State's response was to ask a Monroe County court to bar his wife and him from their property which they retain title to and have not been paid for to prevent them from further documenting the environmental devastation and continuing violations. Shoddy construction has led to repairs within a few months of opening. The road is sinking in places and bridge structures have had to be replaced. Tax-payer funded sweetheart land deals are rampant reaching to the high levels within INDOT. This has been documented and may be part of the reason that shifting the route to save money and the environment was not considered. He objected to being cut to 3 minutes of speaking time.

Jeff Mulzer, the chairman of Hoosier Voices for I-69, said it was his fourth time travelling north on I-69. Usually his trips are to Indianapolis. He was fortunate to be able to drive on it the weekend after it opened. He can already see an increase in traffic as more people use the road. It doesn't matter where the people are from—the road is being used. You will see an increase of traffic coming through town due to I-69. Road funding is a serious issue both locally and statewide. He read an excerpt from the Courier and Press. The article supported beefing up funding for transportation now that the Major Moves toll road lease money has been spent or allocated. The House injected \$250 million more each year by increasing the state's share of gas tax that goes to infrastructure spending and setting aside 20% of the sales tax on gas purchases. The Senate increased funding by \$200 million per year through similar mechanisms but also set aside another \$200 million per year to create a Major Moves 2020 account. This would eventually be used to add lanes to I-65 and I-70 as well as complete the I-69 extension from Indianapolis to Evansville. Both of those are in line with what Governor Pence was asking for. With that we can be pretty sure that there will be adequate funding for state and local transportation budgets. What is smart is to plan wisely by saying that we are going to build this and we will decide how to do it right. It is time to insert this into your TIP to help build the best road for the best value. The improvements in Martinsville will take at-grade crossings with stoplights and turning them into overpasses. That will provide some benefit for Bloomington. He urged the PC to add Section 5 into the TIP.

Lucille Bertuccio spoke against the amendment. She was concerned that by building I-69 all of the other roads and bridges will be neglected in Indiana. Where are we going to get the appropriations from? It sounds like the money will be taken from other things that it was set aside for. Those monies could be spent on schools or mass transportation. We should look at where those monies are coming from. This road is foolish to be built at a time of climate change. It will encourage use of petroleum fuels. We could put our money into mass transportation and move people around much better and more appropriately. The idea of I-69 and the bypass are foolish ideas. Vote no.

Liz Irwin represented Hoosier Voices for I-69 and the Bloomington Chamber of Commerce. She presented videos of people working on I-69 road construction who were not able to attend a meeting in the middle of the day. They were all in favor of voting yes. There were 5 workers presented. They were all in favor of building the road and felt it would bring more job opportunities to the area during and after construction. Similar comments were made by Mark Eads (Speads Trucking) and another speaker (Crider & Crider). They feel a yes vote would speed up the economic recovery.

Sarah Clevenger said you should plan for the future not for the past. The future in transportation is mass transportation. We need to re-establish the railroad system and taking the trucks off of the roads. She experienced the Depression. They paid for things with money. Credit cards were unheard of. The MPO is being offered a credit card with uncertain financial capabilities. Vote no until you know where the money is coming from. Re-appropriation of monies by the legislature would take money from schools and existing roads and bridges that need repair. I-69 would make it difficult for pedestrians.

Larry Jacobs presented more video interviews. Speakers included Chad Moore (Crider & Crider) spoke in favor I-69 construction for providing construction jobs in the area. He felt the road would bring manufacturing jobs and warehousing facilities to Bloomington. Vote yes. The next speaker was Shawn Berry (Crider & Crider) who was in charge of Section 4 interchange at SR 37. His construction job supports his family. There is not a lot of Interstate work going on and he was proud to be part of I-69. Vote yes. The next video speaker was Douglas Dalton of Prairie Materials. They furnish the concrete for I-69. It has been important to give work to his family and business. I-69 will hopefully bring manufacturing jobs and better paying jobs to Bloomington. It could provide jobs to bring more people to Bloomington and keep families here. Vote yes.

Larry Jacobs of the Chamber of Commerce spoke in favor of I-69. He said it is approaching fast and will bring more traffic to the Bloomington area when Section 4 opens in 2014. Our community needs to prepare for that influx. He asked the PC to vote yes. A delayed vote will mean a delay in beginning those improvements.

Donna Lentz Ferree said she thinks there is a difference of opinion between city and country. That is the biggest problem of all. She would like to see a compromise. While the Chamber of Commerce was able to give some of you a bird's eye view of the destruction caused by I-69, she would like to give the PC a hayride. She can show you at least 4 roads that have been raped of their scenery. She would like for the PC to meet some of her neighbors who have been very hurt by this. This has caused a lot of serious emotional distress among her community. It isn't fair to always put them on the back burner. It looks like a tornado has come through and devastated the area. She thinks the traffic will be dangerous when you mix little cars and two-trailer trucks. Vote no. Stop selling off Monroe County land to the State of Indiana.

Darby McCarty spoke for the Ellettsville. The Ellettsville Richland Township Community Council has no opposition to I-69. They believe that I-69 will improve Ellettsville. With an I-69 interchange going to Ellettsville there is great opportunity for the empty acreage to be developed west of Ellettsville. Indiana is still losing population. She hopes that I-69 will encourage businesses to locate in Indiana in the area that is rich with fiber communications. Vote yes.

Scott Wells said that everything is based on trust. However INDOT's record does not reflect that. There has been 20 years of red flags from INDOT, former Governor Mitch Daniels and the cash boondoggle shortfall for I-69 is obviously here now. INDOT's most recent breach of trust—On April 2, the Tokarskis were called into court. They had some very revealing pictures documenting that INDOT has not put up any erosion control protections. The judge has not made a ruling on a Writ of Assistance yet. INDOT sued the Tokarskis saying that their land was overpriced. But, they didn't sue INDOT chief Troy Woodruff and his family who are now being investigated by the federal government or Barry Elkins who made \$1.8 million for his 140-acre tract in the corridor. They should just be fair especially if it's all about trust. He said that many of the PC approved Section 4 believing that Section 5 would be built as soon as possible to minimize the traffic impacts. This TIP decision should be denied until a funding source is identified. The worst scenario is to start Section 5 construction without adequate funding to complete the project. Vote no.

Nicki Johnson with CFC said they spoke in favor of including Section 4 in the TIP. For the same reasons they asked the PC to vote yes. They believe that I-69 will result in increased economic development and jobs. INDOT has committed to work with local officials, committed money for aesthetics and safety.

Sandra Tokarski, a member of CARR, responded to person calling agricultural land unused. It is already being used. It is producing a product that is good all of us. We all like to eat. She wanted the PC to know that the quotes in the newspaper from INDOT saying that the Tokarskis were blocking construction equipment and interfering with the work are blatant lies. It is a sad commentary that for some reason the State's attorney felt she had to send those statements to the court. We were on the property. We own the property. We did not block the construction (devastation) in any way. Sweetheart land deals are rampant costing taxpayers exorbitant amounts of money. This may be one of the reasons that shifting the route to save money and the environment was not considered. Sections 1-3 were rushed perhaps so that the governor could drive on it. Section 4 opening may be delayed until 2015. Funding sources are reduced. The MPO was extorted to put part of I-69 in its TIP. Extortion has no place in a

democracy. The PC must understand that they are working with agencies that are not acting in good faith. The CARR phone number is 812-825-9555. They would love to give the MPO a tour of Indian Creek Township.

Kirk White, a former member of the Bloomington City Council, said that his view is that I-69 is already part of the state plan and will connect lots of state universities and Crane. Until recently our community has not embraced I-69 and formulated methods to best take advantage of these new opportunities. The result could be that Bloomington might be bypassed by the positive externalities of the highway. In Nov. 1999, then IU-President Miles Brand said in a letter that the construction of I-69 would significantly improve the transportation infrastructure in this area, make our region more competitive in seeking and retaining jobs in manufacturing and hi-tech jobs. He has voted to include I-69 in the County Highway Plan because it is important to include it with local planning. A community always gains the most when joint planning occurs and people work together. Vote yes.

Sarah Ryterband thanked Mr. Baker for bringing a resolution to the CAC to delay any decision on this TIP amendment until we have all of the answers that we want. A 5-month delay to get real commitments from the State doesn't seem like much to her. She was grateful to INDOT for their commitments and cooperation. We have come a long way. The next big step then is to delay a bit longer to get real commitments. To vote on this TIP amendment before you have real answers or genuine commitments as we have learned from INDOT does not pay in the end. Vote no.

Christy Gillenwater from the Southwest Indiana Chamber of Commerce encouraged the PC to vote for the TIP amendment. Bloomington as well as the communities in southwestern Indiana will all benefit from I-69. The highway and further improvements will result in improved safety. I-69 has provided opportunities for increased interaction between communities and businesses along the corridor. She invited Bloomington to come to Evansville after the road is constructed.

Jim Shelton of the Bloomington Chamber of Commerce noted that they have hosted local collaboration meetings for the past year and a half. That brought together local officials and professionals to put together a list of common needs to be presented to INDOT. That list was presented to INDOT in a series of meetings. We got very positive responses out of INDOT including commitments to work together. Now it is time to start improving SR 37. The Chamber is more than willing to keep holding these meetings as we work with INDOT on projects. Vote yes.

Mr. Ruff said he wanted to recognize INDOT staff and the work that they have done with the community members. He also wanted to recognize the local Chamber and their efforts to do the best thing for the community. He did object to the Chamber saying that it was time to put politics aside. This doesn't have anything to do with politics. Republican and Democrat governors have all supported I-69. Voice for I-69 has to have some accountability. They make a lot of public statements and issue a lot of press releases and brochures. He believes that they also act with community interest in mind. Over the years, they have put out some amazing statements. He has been collecting things from Voices and presented a few. The small one came out in a brochure—It says that “extending I-69 will increase sales output in Indiana by more than \$12 billion.” INDOT's own EIS points to Bloomington economic impact with or without I-69 and the impact is almost negligible. They also say that southwest Indiana has long been cut off from the rest of the state. He pointed out that South Bend isn't connected to the rest of the state either. South Bend to Monument Circle is 140 miles and 3 hours, 7 minutes driving time. Evansville is 183 and 3 hours and 12 minutes driving time without I-69. Warsaw, Indiana is famous for manufacturing medical devices, prosthetics and implants and has no interstates. If you look at economic statistics for the state, it is a myth that southwest Indiana lags behind any other comparable part of the state. It also a myth that there are more traffic accidents, safety problems in that area. It has been blindly

embraced by well meaning people. Also, it's not true that the I-69 route is the shortest distance between two points. It does not justify an interstate dividing our community and Monroe County further. Section 6 does not even have a plan for connecting onto 465. I-69 will make Bloomington and Monroe County even more of a bedroom community. Saying that it will increase business is purely speculative. We need a high-speed rail not I-69. For funding, Mr. Stark says that money for I-69 will be diverted from other important state funds.

Mr. Coyne said that Section 4 is already coming. It's in the TIP. A great deal of work went into determining safety improvements that would be needed in Section 5. INDOT committed to make those safety improvements. If we delay this, there is no end to what the commitments will be required of INDOT. They don't have control over that. What we are asking for are things outside of INDOT's control. If we delay that until something can be worked out with the City and the County on the City and County's portion of these projects there is a chance that nothing will ever happen. It is not the question of whether INDOT will live up to their commitments the question is now do we live up to ours. And for that reason, he made the following motion:

*****Mr. Coyne moved inclusion of Section 5 into the TIP. Mr. Gallagher seconded.**

Mr. Kruzan thanked Mr. Coyne for his service on the MPO. He said he would support the motion. He had a helicopter ride over the route. He felt that he was with a microcosm of Bloomington. Some people saw progress. He believed that Andy Ruff saw devastation. One of the more emotional moments of his political career was sitting across from Andy Ruff who has been working on this for 22 years. Andy can be a real Chatty Cathy. The only person who can be Chatty Cathier is me. They were talking about flying on other helicopters up until they hit the construction site. For the entirety of that 40 minute trip, Andy Ruff said not a word except once answering Mr. Kruzan asked him where the Tokarski property. He told Mr. Kruzan that it was right underneath them. That is the only thing he said for the entire trip. He said that he was amazed at Mr. Ruff's positive attitude of looking at that and even thinking that it could be undone. Mr. Kruzan said to him the damage has been done and the war being waged now is how it's going to happen. We must do the best we can. He discussed different points of view that will result in the vote that a person casts. We need to leverage what is best for the community. He said he was counting on the Chamber and the proponents of this project to do. Too many proponents have supported I-69 without understanding at all the cost to the local community is. He finds that to be an amazing thing especially when it comes from the business community—to support a project and not know what the bottom line is. He didn't think that we would have gotten as much cooperation from INDOT had it not been for the business community's involvement. And he believes that we won't get much further along the route without the business community working with INDOT. He said that he had been holding out hoping that John Gregg would be elected governor. He knows who the new governor is and who we will be negotiating with for at least 4 years. The Chamber and the business community are going to have more clout with the governor than the liberal mayor of Bloomington is. That is why he is voting for the motion today.

Mr. Baker said that he is going to vote no today. Mr. Coyne and Mr. Kruzan's comments are very good. He is almost in agreement. What holds him back is the idea of trust and uncertainty. He feels like they have to go further and he believes in being collaborative. It's the matter of saying that you will work with someone to get a job done but we'll talk later about how much each side is going to put in. He didn't think he could get anything from a banker with that approach. It would be a rare occurrence for him to trust someone that much. We need further negotiations before voting. He thanked INDOT for coming along. Mr. Stark in this latest letter to us made another step toward us. We have to do our very best for our community and that's what he felt like he was doing.

Mr. Martin said that he is unaware of any issue that they have been discussing for the last year that was not also an issue identified in the comments to the Draft EIS statement. None of this is new. We have been discussing these issues for years now—some well over 5 years. The fact that we haven't got some particular plan solidified simply means that we have failed to do what we were supposed to have been doing all along. That is true on both sides of the issue here. All of us have failed this community in one way or another. He wanted to comment on some statements that were made earlier. Mr. Moore from Martinsville said that they are waiting for the opportunity to get it right. Mr. Martin had been hoping that he would have the opportunity to get it right. We asked for that opportunity when we voted on Section 4. He fully expected an opportunity to get it right when the vote for Section 5 came up. He found that even those aspects of the plan as it existed at that time got even further pared back to save money. For the last 5 years all this has been about is reducing the cost of the highway through Monroe County. That hurts Monroe County. We had a better plan for this highway 5 years ago than we have today. That is simply because we have taken money out of the project because the State doesn't have the funds to support it at the level they anticipated. Jeff Mulzer of the Voices of I-69 said that we needed to plan wisely and we need to get the best value we can get out of the highway. We seem not to have done that. We seem to be losing value all the time. We are not planning wisely because we haven't got a plan in place. We are operating on a hope and a prayer here that this is all going to work out. Everyone is going to do their best. He understood that. The question is—is the best that they are going to do sufficient for this community? He hasn't seen that yet. The issue that came before us when we did Section 4 as had been pointed out was the issue of safety. We brought this up early in the discussions on Section 4. Ms. Flum set us up a timetable of the process that would go through for Section 5 so that we could get a timely decision. He noted that the activity that we are engaged in today was originally supposed to have occurred last November. They haven't met their time schedule on this that's for sure. There are a lot of reasons why. The work that has to be done is difficult and there is a lot of it to do. By failing to deal with the impacts of this induced traffic that we have to prepare for--this influx of traffic—is that we are going to be shifting our crash reports from the 37 corridor where they now show the highest number to other corridors that are going north/south/east/west in the community. We are going to have more traffic yet we have no plan in place to manage that traffic on those other roadways. The micro-simulation that was done for the Third St. corridor indicates that that traffic corridor is going to fail us. If you have to drive it very often now you might say that it fails you already. But, we are going to see in these annual crash reports the numbers along that corridor continue to escalate until we spend the money to deal with the issues that have been created by this highway. We could avoid that but it means that commitments have to be made on the part of the Federal Government and the State Highway to solve those problems that are being created. They are not going to go away magically. They are going to be there and we have to deal with them. To him, "planning wisely" is understanding that and putting those plans in place so that we don't end up watching those numbers escalate until the crash report reaches that magic 5% and then the State has to put money into it. We don't want to get there. That's not the kind of community that we are. We can be better than that. But, by moving too fast here we are not going to get there. We are doing a disservice to the people of this community if we approve this plan without some kind of very positive and focused plan to deal with the consequences of the induced traffic that this is going to create. This is really a prime example of the case of being penny wise and pound foolish. It's just very discouraging to him. We haven't even seen what Alternative 8 looks like and yet they are supposed to vote on its policy. How do I vote on a policy for something that I've never even looked at? He said he didn't know how to do that. How does he separate out the issues of this little corridor which is their responsibility from the issues of the broader community which is his responsibility? Those things are bound together too tightly to separate them out. If we are planning wisely we are doing it all not just a piece of it.

Mr. Sabbagh said that as the Chairman of the CAC he felt that he had to comment on the resolution that was passed by the CAC. The vote was 12 to 10 in favor of the resolution. The resolution said

essentially don't commit to Section 5 until several items are satisfied. He was one of the 10 "no" votes because he felt that the issues brought up in the resolution mostly had already been resolved in the collaborative meetings that the Mayor has talked about. It seemed to him that there was no need to put in another effort on issues that had already been dealt with. One issue in the resolution was the bicycle/pedestrian bridge which has no connection on either side so it seems strange that we would ask for a commitment for a "bridge to nowhere." That caused him an issue. I-69 is here. It is going to connect in 2014. We really have to do the upgrades and the planning now. It is really ironic that this afternoon at 2:30 at Ivy Tech at the O'Bannon Institute there was a community conversation with Judy O'Bannon. He told her this morning that the I-69 vote was coming up. She said that Frank was very much in favor and in fact it was Frank O'Bannon that chose the route. It wasn't Mitch or Mike Pence that chose the route. He agreed that this should not be partisan political—Republican or Democrat. It is a community and a statewide effort. He referred to Mr. White's mention of an education and high tech corridor. He said he believes in high tech corridors. He would like to have a commitment from INDOT to put in conduit when they dig up the intersection to build the road. Not only would we get the concrete highway but we get the information super highway which would also help the community. He appreciated Mr. Coyne's comments and the Mayor's comments. He will be voting yes. While the CAC said that he should vote "no" there is ample precedent on the CAC of the voting members of the CAC to vote yes when the CAC said no.

Ms. Munson said that she has spoken to the MPO over the years from the other side of the table as a strong opponent of I-69 especially Section 4 because of the new terrain cutting across karst landscapes. Today, she has listened to the public comment, listened to our representatives from INDOT whose work she appreciates, listened to the Voices of I-69 and the Chamber of Commerce whose work she also appreciates and she picked up on a few key words. She also heard the words "plan wisely," "work together," and "trust." Those resonate with her. She said she has a hard time trusting INDOT because of how karst features were misrepresented when the route was chosen for I-69. The Environmental document simply buried studies that showed exactly what kind of impact Section 4 would have. This has been demonstrated. INDOT knows it. Some of the public may not know it though. At the same time, I know that Section 4 is being built. They haven't started pouring concrete or probably asphalt because it's cheaper, she believed. Trees would grow back but INDOT has already let the contracts and she was sure that Section 4 would be built. Therefore she believes that the safety improvements of Section 5 are very important. But she is the representative of the Monroe County Council on the MPO. That is the fiscal body of county government. The County Council knows well that we have a limited pot of money for highway construction—for both local projects and projects that require a local match for State assisted projects. People have to know that the County has a very long wish list of projects that have been in long range planning for a long time. She would vote yes for Section 5 in the TIP only when she can see commitments from INDOT for funding those projects that will address I-69's impact to local transportation and when INDOT can demonstrate that they actually have finances in hand to construct I-69. Her vote will be no today. She was also at the CAC meeting and heard the discussions. She was a bit surprised. The County Council has taken no position on putting I-69 in the TIP. This is her decision based on what she thinks is best for Monroe County. She hopes that INDOT and local government can continue to work together to find the best resolution for the safety improvements and the local transportation connectivity that we need because of what I-69 is bringing here.

Mr. Swafford noted that several years ago Ellettsville had a similar situation. Ellettsville had an old state road that went through town and it was a nightmare. It was planned 20 years ago or longer. INDOT came in and made changes and proposals that they were afraid of that they would ruin their small fragile little town. But they proceeded on the new SR 46. After it was completed it improved their town tremendously. It used to take 35 minutes to get to Bloomington because of traffic and all the wrecks. It now takes 7 ½ to 9 minutes to get from downtown Ellettsville to Bloomington. He also said that when

they built it there were things that they asked for that they didn't get. But, INDOT did not leave them. They are still making improvements to the highway. He believed that if 20 years from now after I-69 goes through there are major problems INDOT will not go away. They will hear the people and stand up and help fix the solution.

*****Roll call vote was taken. Yes votes: Lynn Coyne, Susie Johnson, Mark Kruzan, Kent McDaniel, Dan Swafford, David Sabbagh, Bill Williams, Ryan Gallagher. No votes: Jack Baker, Richard Martin, Andy Ruff, Cheryl Munson. The motion passed by a vote of 8:4.**

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

A. Topic Suggestions for Future Agendas

IX. Upcoming Meetings

A. Technical Advisory Committee – April 24, 2013 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)

B. Citizens Advisory Committee – April 24, 2013 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)

C. Policy Committee – May 10, 2013 at 1:30 p.m. (Council Chambers)

The meeting was adjourned.

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

These minutes were approved by the Policy Committee at their regular meeting held on, June 14, 2013 (ALD)