



**Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
June 14, 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), Jason Banach (IU Real Estate), Susie Johnson (Public Works), Richard Martin (County Plan Commission, Kent McDaniel (BT), Andy Ruff City Council), Iris Kiesling (County Commissioners), David Sabbagh (MPO-CAC), Dan Swafford (Town of Ellettsville), Cheryl Munson (County Council), Mark Kruzan (Bloomington Mayor), Jason Lowther (INDOT), Jay DuMontelle (FHWA) and Bill Williams (County Highway).

Others: Adrian Reid (City Engineering), Nan Brewer (citizen), Joe McWhorter (Perry Clear Creek Fire Dept.), Paul T. Ash (citizen), Elizabeth Cox-Ash (citizen), Lew May (Bloomington Transit), and Sandra Flum (INDOT).

MPO Staff: Vince Caristo, Anna Dragovich, Scott Robinson, and Jane Weiser

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes--Mr. Martin asked that roll call votes reflect which members voted for or against an action item. Mr. McDaniel asked for that change to the minutes. Mr. Banach abstained from voting on the April minutes since he was not at that meeting.

a. April 12, 2013

b. May 10, 2013

*****Mr. Martin moved approval of both sets of minutes. Ms. Munson seconded. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote. (Mr. Banach abstained.)**

III. Communications from the Chair -- None

IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees

a. Citizens Advisory Committee –Mr. Sabbagh said that the CAC discussed the TIP, the LRTP, and the Feasibility Study on the one-way pairs (1st St. and 2nd St.). A motion was made to accept the TIP but the motion failed after a roll call vote was taken.

b. Technical Advisory Committee – Mr. Reid said the TAC voted in favor of adoption of the TIP with one dissenting vote.

V. Reports from the MPO Staff

a. MTP Task Force ---Ms. Dragovich reported that the consultant is still working on the traffic analysis zones and the model. At the next meeting they will be discussing the vision statement.

b. 2012 Crash Report – Mr. Caristo presented the report. He explained tables and how they have changed from the last crash report. (See report for details.) A new table illustrates the distribution of bike and pedestrian crash by month. As suspected the most active months are May and October. He presented a graph that showed that young drivers and elderly drivers are over-represented in fatal crashes. He would like to record crashes at all intersections in the future. Then you could compare crash rates among similar kinds of intersections.

Mr. McDaniel asked when and where the Crash Report would be posted. Mr. Caristo said it would be posted on the BMCMPPO Clearinghouse on the website. Ms. Kiesling asked if the report takes into account that the Hilly Hundred takes place in October. It could impact the data. Mr. Caristo said it could be a factor.

Mr. Martin asked what “the sum of average daily traffic entering intersection” means. What is the sum over what interval? Mr. Caristo said this is a standard way of calculating exposure values for an intersection. We find the average daily traffic for each approach entering the intersection. Mr. Martin asked where the 12, 6, and 3 numbers come from. How are they weighted? Mr. Caristo said it was standard to weight a fatal crash at 12, an injury crash at 3 and property crashes at 1. The results from using that system did not vary from non-weighted results. Mr. Martin asked how we translate the data we are collecting into changes we have made. Mr. Caristo said that staff has noticed that construction projects result in higher crash rates. The Crash Report is to provide information to the MPO committees and can result in the MPO contacting LPAs. He said that the improvements at Old SR 37 and Dunn St. were a direct result of the application for HSIP funds based on the Crash Report. Staff is applying to the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute using some of this data for funds to reduce unsafe behaviors of bicycles, pedestrians and motor vehicle users. Mr. Sabbagh thanked Mr. Caristo for the report.

VI. Old Business

VII. New Business—Mr. McDaniel explained the procedure guidelines for public comment.

- a. **2014 – 2017 Transportation Improvement Program***-- Ms. Dragovich presented the report. This TIP is fiscally constrained. It includes mostly carryover projects. The TA funding and HSIP funding are listed as illustrative projects only in this TIP. Three comments were submitted during the public comment period. The CAC did not recommend approval. The TAC did recommend approval. INDOT is withdrawing the bridge project from the TIP. Mr. Martin asked when FY 2014 begins. Ms. Dragovich said July 1, 2013. Mr. Martin asked why Section 4 of I-69 is not in this TIP. Mr. Reid said funds are obligated so it is considered funded. Mr. Baker said the programmed revenues are so much higher than the expenditures in all cases except for in 2017 where expenditure is higher than the revenue. Is that a mistake? Ms. Dragovich said 2014 is so much higher is due to carryover funds. Mr. Martin asked why the projects in Appendix 4 don't include Bloomington or State of Indiana projects. Ms. Dragovich said the State has to deal with its own fiscal constraint. This is just to show what they are spending. Mr. Martin said graphic is not clear that State projects are not included. Ms. Munson asked if the portion of Fullerton Pike in the TIP is not 4-lane. Ms. Dragovich said yes. Ms. Munson wanted to know in regard to the Fullerton Pike project why the CAC was so split in their vote and why there was a “no” vote on the TIP from the TAC. Mr. Sabbagh said that there was a lot of extraneous discussion. There was not much controversy on the TIP but on Fullerton Pike and 2nd St. specifically. He said there are personality clashes on the CAC. Mr. Baker said some CAC members don't want to do a feasibility study on 2nd St. and voted no because of that. Mr. Micuda said he was the single negative vote on the TIP at TAC because he is concerned about long term effects of the 4-laning and potential cost implications. Ms. Munson said the Fullerton Pike project is limited to the area between Walnut St. and Walnut St. Pike. It does not include the 4-laning of Fullerton, Gordon Pike or further east on Rhorer Rd. Ms. Dragovich said the money requested today is for a portion of the entire project. The County will have to request more funding for subsequent phases. Mr. McDaniel asked why this short portion is so expensive. Mr. Williams explained the \$3.4 million for construction overall. The intersection of Walnut St. Pike will be included. That involves a left turn lane and the installation of a traffic signal. Mr. McDaniel asked if the rest of the project on Fullerton is not done is this portion worth doing. Mr. Williams said yes. It has been a problem for a long time. Mr. Martin asked if the east SR 45 project is the same project that INDOT pulled several years ago. Mr. Micuda said this project is pavement overlay only. The pulled project had a much larger scope. Mr. Martin said he looked at the non-I-69 projects INDOT is planning to do and the list is a much shorter list than before. Where is the money? It all seems to be going in one place. Are we not getting as much money as we used to get? Mr. Ruff said on INDOT's own web page and see that 40% of all of the transportation funding that



the State has is going to I-69. Mr. Swafford asked about the light at Matthews and SR 46 location. He understood that it would be located on the other side of Matthews and SR 46. Ms. Dragovich said they would clarify before submitting to INDOT.

*****Ms. Kiesling moved approval of the TIP for 2014-2017. Mr. Sabbagh seconded.**

Public comment:

Nan Brewer was on the CAC for the Fullerton project. She doesn't remember the vote being taken. She disagreed that the negative recommendation came from personality difference. The CAC public meeting held at Batchelor Middle School attracted huge numbers of neighbors in response to the Fullerton Pike project. They did not think it was appropriate for an I-69 arterial road to go through neighborhoods. Doing this one section connection seems like too much money for a residential area. The only commercial intersection there is on Business SR 37. Unless the zoning in that section is changed to commercial, it seems you are assuming a change is coming. The traffic study showed that taking a residential area and increasing traffic will make it more dangerous not less. She and her neighbors living in the Batchelor Middle School area would like to see traffic slowed and reduced. Bigger roads will make Fullerton in that area commercial. Houses are selling or becoming day cares already. She asked the PC to vote no. They should vote on the entire Fullerton Pike project rather than breaking it up into pieces.

Elizabeth Cox-Ash from the McDoel Gardens Neighborhood Association and the CAC was concerned that the hospital has never stated if they are going to stay or relocate. She did not vote for the TIP because she opposes the Fullerton Pike project. She would support the traffic study and the careful pairing of 2nd St. and 1st St. especially if the hospital would commit to staying. We need more information before approving the TIP.

Paul Ash who is on the Bike & Ped Commission, is from McDoel Gardens and is on the CAC said we need to study these issues so that we know what we are doing before doing anything. This is unlike what the State did where they decided they were going to build I-69 and then pretended to study it.

Joe McWhorter, fire chief of Perry-Clear Creek Fire Dept, said that improving Fullerton would help fire equipment movement. It would make it safer for them. It is very difficult to get east or west especially during times with high traffic volume.

Final discussion:

Mr. Baker said he doesn't know what the hospital wants. We haven't heard from them for months. He would like to know what the hospital needs before spending money on a feasibility study being done in a vacuum.

Mr. Kruzan said he would not be surprised if the hospital moves. But the feasibility study is not for the hospital but for the entire community. The location of the hospital does not require that we build one-way pairs. We are not waiting on the hospital. If the hospital moves there would be massive redevelopment in that area. We want to know all of the possibilities available to us. The study does not in any way pre-suppose that we are going to build one-way pairs.

Mr. Martin said he would like to know why the project is named what it is. Can we make the location and the project express what you want to do? Ms. Dragovich said staff was given this name. This is what the LPAs requested. Ms. Johnson said they would be happy to rename the feasibility study to more accurately reflect the intent. Mr. Martin asked if there is a proposed traffic light at Walnut St. Pike and Rhorer Rd. Mr. Williams said there was and there is also a possibility of a roundabout at that location.

Mr. Sabbagh explained that he was referring to the personality conflicts that occur at the CAC meetings. During the meeting the chairman was asked if he was going to vote the way the CAC voted. Someone brought up that



**Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Policy Committee**

in the CAC bylaws the chairman has to vote the way the CAC votes. The MPO staff said the chairman did not have to vote the way the CAC votes. The chairman said that he had voted his conscience before. This was not new. There was a motion for a “no confidence” vote for the chairman. That vote failed. Anybody can vote his conscience. He will continue to vote his conscience. It was asked if the chairman accurately reflected the opinions of the CAC. He asked if after the draft CAC minutes are approved if they could be included as part of the Policy Committee minutes.

Mr. McDaniel said that didn't seem appropriate.

Mr. Lowther wanted to note that the signal location at SR 46 and Matthews Drive is supposed to be in the westbound direction.

Mr. Kruzan said that Fullerton Pike has long been considered a southern bypass of sorts. He is concerned about what it will do to neighborhoods. This will have impact on City residents now and in the future. We have some people in County government impatient with the City concerning the lack of annexation of the AIFA. This road will likely be within city limits in the near future. His concern is that the project is being expanded at a level that exceeds what we likely would do--16-ft lanes instead of 12-ft lanes, etc. This is an area ripe for improvement. The signalization makes sense. We ought to have a broader discussion about the Fullerton project and its financial impact. It will be a \$30 million project overall. He said he would ask to delay action on this part of the TIP. He did not want to kill funding to the County. He has discussed this with staff. Mr. Micuda said the TIP could still be approved. The project could be taken out of TIP and brought back at any time.

There was more discussion about removing the Fullerton Pike project from the TIP temporarily.

Mr. Martin sees a disconnect between our land-use planning in the City and County and transportation planning. There has not been a careful examination of the land-use implications of this southern connector. We have not been consistent with the decisions made in the area assuming both that the road was and was not going to be done.

Mr. Kruzan was concerned that the strip of Rhorer Rd. needs the light and intersection improvement but shouldn't be considered part of a larger Fullerton Pike project. He would like to discuss with the County the plans for that improvement project as a future part of the city prior to a vote.

Mr. Baker said we should start small and build up later like we have done on Tapp Rd. We have been pushed by I-69 coming through and worried about a lot more traffic being dumped in there. I don't think that will happen immediately.

Mr. Ruff suggested moving forward with the Mayor's amendment and then vote on the whole TIP.

Ms. Munson spoke as a County representative. She supported the stand-alone concept.

Mr. Sabbagh wants the improvement to Old SR 37 whether or not the rest of Fullerton happens. People cannot walk or bike on that street as it is now. Mr. Ruff said that no one is proposing not doing anything.

Ms. Kiesling supported including this section at this point. Mr. Williams said the lanes will only be 12-feet wide. This project has been in 2030 and 2035 Long Range Transportation Plans with the identical cross-section that we are talking about today.

*****Ms. Kiesling called the question on the main motion. (There was no second.)**



*****Mr. Ruff moved to withdraw the Fullerton Pike intersection proposal from the TIP and to put together a City/County study committee made up of the Commissioners, the Council of the County, the Mayor's office, the Council of the City, and the Plan Staff to report by next meeting. Mr. Kruzan seconded.**

Mr. Martin suggested that there be a City/County study committee formed as part of the preliminary engineering activity to report back to the MPO in September regarding acceptable design alternatives. The City has not had sufficient input in this process to date. If we take the money away, nothing is going to happen. We don't need to pull it out of this. We just need to dedicate ourselves to solving the problem.

Mr. Robinson suggested removing the funding to obligate it later as an amendment later on. That would show that there is interest in looking at this area as an illustrative project.

Mr. Kruzan asked if they could remove the project without removing the money.

Mr. DuMontelle said in normal circumstances, the federal money does not go away. However the MAP21 act ends at the end of 2014.

Mr. Kruzan wanted to make sure the funds would not be taken away from the County.

*****Roll call vote was taken. The motion failed (6:7). (Yes votes: Banach, Baker, Johnson, Kruzan, McDaniel, Ruff; No votes: Martin, Swafford, Kiesling, Sabbagh, Munson, Williams, Lowther.)**

*****Mr. Martin moved to amend the original motion that leaves the Fullerton project in but asks our LPAs of Monroe County and City of Bloomington to engage in a discussion about the impact of this particular section that is proposed here with respect to City and County land use plans and with respect to future development of that corridor at some other point in time and to report back to us as a body at our next regularly scheduled meeting. Ms. Munson seconded. Roll call vote was taken. The motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. McDaniel noted that the next action would be voting on the original motion as amended.

Mr. Ruff said he didn't want to vote against the TIP. Section 5 is in this TIP. We have just learned that the State Legislature has seen fit to take hundreds of millions of dollars out of the State's General Fund to put toward I-69. This is money that could go to the state's public schools, healthcare, economic development, etc. Monroe County is going to be facing another referendum. Funds are drying up mostly due to spending on I-69. The idea of "fiscal constraint" is somewhat meaningless when looking at the money the State has spent and is going to be spent on Sections 4 & 5 of I-69. Hoosiers will pay for this for generations. He said he will vote against the TIP. Some of the local projects are very important and needed. The projects connected to I-69 are to promote the expansion of the project. This kind of capacity expansion drives development which causes congestion, etc.

*****Roll call vote was called on the original motion as amended. The motion was approved by a vote of 10:3. (Yes votes: Banach, Baker, Johnson, Kruzan, McDaniel, Swafford, Kiesling, Sabbagh, Williams, Lowther.) (No votes: Martin, Ruff, Munson.)**

VIII. Communications from Committee Members (*non-agenda items*) Mr. Martin said that he has learned that a substantial cavern as opposed to a sinkhole has opened up in Section 4. He requested a change to their memorandum of understanding to get Fish & Wildlife—or whatever group—involved in understanding the consequences of that and what has to happen as a result of the discovery of that particular feature.



**Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Policy Committee**

Sandra Flum said that one sinkhole in a picture in the newspaper was known, excavated as part of the treat of the sinkhole in preparation for the road and reviewed by Karst MOA agencies including Fish & Wildlife, IDEM, DNR, & INDOT. Any additional connectivity to that sinkhole would have those same reviews as we find it. As you excavate you discover topology. The agencies have been consulted up front and they have reviewed this and each additional finds.

Mr. Martin said that a structure that large underground has a very large drainage system involved in it. A lot of water goes through there. That water leaves this your corridor and travels to other citizens who are dependant on it. At least during the time that there is this exposure, there is a considerable amount of material moving into that cave system that wasn't there before. He was really concerned that adequate protection has been taken now. The hole he saw had collapsed. It wasn't dug. There is a whole lot of material in it.

a. Topic Suggestions for Future Agendas

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- a. Technical Advisory Committee – June 26, 2013 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)**
- b. Citizens Advisory Committee – June 26, 2013 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)**
- c. Policy Committee – August 9, 2013 at 1:30 p.m. (Council Chambers)**

Adjournment

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