



Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
March 13, 2009 McCloskey Conference Room 135, City Hall

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

Attendance

Policy Committee: Jack Baker (MPO CAC), Susie Johnson (City Public Works Department), Bill Williams (Monroe County Highway Department), Richard Martin (Monroe County Plan Commission), Kent McDaniel (Bloomington Public Transportation Corp.), Frank Nierzwicki (Proxy Ellettsville Town Council), Jim Ude (proxy for Jim Stark, INDOT), Bill Stuebe (City Plan Commission), Lynn Coyne (IU VP/CAO office), Patrick Stoffers (Monroe County Commission, Andy Ruff (City Council), Julie Thomas (County Council) and Mark Kruzan (City Mayor).

Others: Adrian Reid (Bloomington Engineering), Lew May (Bloomington Transit), Janice Osadczuk (FHWA), Tom Micuda (City Planning), Shado Spring (Elders for Earth's Children), Suzanne Mittenthal (Hoosier Hikers Council), Sarah Combellick-Bidney (Bloomington Against I-69), Lary Smith (BA I-69), Brooke Clark (BA I-69), Joan Cochran (BA I-69), Jan Hayes (BA I-69), Ransom Haile (BA I-69), Jim Hart (Center for Sustainable Living), Thomas Tokarski (CARR), Charles Savage, Tom Glastras (CARR), Dave Cox (CARR), Lucille Bertuccio (CSL), Steve Hendricks (CARR), Sam Frushorr (Bloomington, IN Grotto), Jane Henderson (CARR), Mari Dagaz, Jaime Sweany (Wandering Turtle), Sarah Clevenger (CARR), Janice Clevenger (CARR), Ron Brown (Bloomington Bicycle Club), Stephanie Kane (CARR), Ronald Gilliland, Janice Gilliland, Phil Wisniewski (CARR), Jim Hettmer, Alex Smith (BA I-69), Bethany Braley (BA I-69), Elsa Harik, Leif Hagglund, Jess A. Gwinn, Linda Greene, Cory Govea, Sandra Tokarski (CARR), Sophia & Gregory Travis, Mercedes Rodriguez (Herald-Times), Jay Mitchell (INDOT), Justin Wykoff (City Engineering), Emmanuel Nsonwu (INDOT), Mary Jo Hamman (Michael Baker, Jr., Inc.), David A. Butts (INDOT), Jeffrey F. Huntsman, Andrea Roberts (City Public Works), Brian Garvey, Sura Gail Tala, Lily Kleinlein, and Donna Lentz Ferree.

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

I. Call to Order - Kent McDaniel called the meeting to order. The Policy Committee members introduced themselves.

II. Approval of Minutes:

A. January 9, 2009—Bill Stuebe moved approval. Richard Martin seconded. Andy Ruff had suggested some changes. He felt the Complete Streets discussion was too vague and didn't reflect the discussion adequately. Mr. Stuebe and Mr. Martin withdrew their motions. Mr. McDaniel said the rewritten minutes would be discussed at the next meeting.

III. Communications from the Chair—There was no report from the Chair.

IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees

A. Citizens Advisory Committee Jack Baker reported that the CAC had discussed the items on this agenda. He will report on the items as they are addressed.



B. Technical Advisory Committee - There was no report.

V. Reports from the MPO Staff

A. Progress Report (FY 2009 – 2nd Quarter) - Ray Hess presented the Progress Report.

VI. Old Business

Mr. Martin said that he had expected a report from Road School and its effect on the Complete Streets Policy. Bill Williams noted that more confusion about the stimulus funds was created at Road School. Mr. Martin asked if they should expect a report at the next meeting. It was decided that should there be changes; they would be considered an item of new business at another meeting.

VII. New Business

A. Census Tract Boundary Delineation

Josh Desmond said that the community has been asked to participate in a program called Participant Statistical Areas Program (PSAP). This is an opportunity for local groups to give advice to the Census Bureau as to what the boundaries of the census tracts and census block groups should be. Some areas are either too large or too small in population or housing units. The public is welcome to participate by looking at the census boundaries and giving MPO staff feedback. Nate Nickel is the person to contact in the Planning Department with any comments or questions.

B. Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

a. Economic Recovery and Reinvestment Act Projects

i. Indiana Department of Transportation (*Action requested)**

Mr. Hess noted that American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) was signed into law on Feb. 17, 2009. Money will be funneled down to the states, to transit providers and to Metropolitan Planning Organizations. INDOT wishes to use these funds to resurface SR 46 between SR 446 to SR 135. The request is for \$3,000,000 of ARRA funds. Mr. Martin asked the total length of the project and if it included redoing the bridge in Nashville. Mr. Ude said it is less than 20 miles in length and the bridge project would be separate. There was no public comment. *****Mr. Coyne moved approval of the SR 46 from SR 446 to SR 135 project. Mr. Martin seconded. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.**

ii. Rural Transit (*Action Requested)**

Mr. Hess explained that Rural Transit was requesting \$927,621 to cover purchasing various vehicles, bus shelters, assorted office equipment, communication equipment, shop tools, upgrade to solar electric system for the facility, etc. Mr. Martin asked where the money would come from for more drivers, maintenance, etc. Mr. McDaniel said that none of this is expansion but replacing and improving existing service and maintenance. The funding source for operating Rural Transit is from the Federal 5311 Program administered by INDOT. They also get public mass transportation funds and funds from the counties that they serve. There was no public comment. *****Mr. Martin moved to approve the Transit Stimulus Package Purchases as outlined in the Policy Committee packet subject to the continuing revision of this approval as necessary**

to meet federal requirements. Mr. Baker seconded. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

iii. Bloomington Transit (*Action Requested)**

Mr. Hess reported that BT would receive \$1,716, 658 in ARRA funds and wishes to upgrade the construction plans for the Downtown Transit Facility to LEED standards. Mr. McDaniel asked for public comment. Jim Hart asked about commitments to bike transportation. Mr. Desmond said the discussion was just about ARRA transit funds now. There will be talk about bike and pedestrian improvements later while discussing funds for road improvements. There is a pot of money at the state level of about \$20 million set aside for transportation enhancement which includes bike trails and sidewalks. Lew May said BT purchased its first 2 hybrid buses in 2006. Late last year they bought 4 more. There is another pot of stimulus money that will be distributed nationally on a competitive basis. That will be for energy-related purposes. BT hopes that hybrid buses will qualify. They hope to replace some diesel buses in their fleet with hybrid buses. Mr. Stuebe asked if they would be domestic buses. Mr. May said there are “Buy America” requirements with federal funding. The requirement is for 60% domestic products. Mr. McDaniel noted that their buses are built by Gillig who buys over half of their parts and supplies from Indiana. Also, BT cannot have a 100% hybrid fleet since they are too tall to fit under the railroad underpass on 10th St. Mr. Baker said that the CAC recommended approving this project. Mr. Hess said that several agencies including BT are including illustrative projects in order not to tie themselves down with details. They may be able to qualify for additional funds in the future especially if other states don’t use all of their funds and the funds are redistributed. Ms. Thomas asked what level of LEED certification they were hoping to attain. Mr. May said they will go for as high a level as they can afford. Mr. McDaniel asked for public comment. Lucille Bertuccio asked if the hybrids are electric or biofuel. Mr. May said they are electric hybrids. They are not biofuel. Ms. Bertuccio said she would encourage smaller buses and more routes. The city should be good for walkers, for people who take buses and bikers. *****Lynn Coyne moved approval of the inclusion of this in the TIP. Bill Stuebe seconded.** Mr. Martin suggested a friendly amendment separating the formulaic funds (\$1.7 million) from the discretionary funds (\$283,000). Mr. McDaniel asked if Mr. Coyne and Mr. Stuebe agreed. They did. **The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.**

Mr. Hess introduced other BT projects that could be eligible for ARRA funds. BT would like to be in a position to put any additional funds to use in a quick time frame so they are proposing illustrative projects. The first project would be the purchase of 5 hybrid buses for \$3,000,000. Mr. McDaniel suggested dealing with all 3 amendments at the same time. Mr. Hess said that the second project is for a facility security camera system for \$50,000. The final project is for fare collection equipment costing \$500,000. Mr. May said that this is to upgrade their current system to be able to swipe cards for fares. The TAC, CAC and staff support all 3 projects. Ms. Thomas asked if these projects are in priority order. Mr. May said the order they would prefer would be the transfer station, the hybrid buses, the collection equipment and the surveillance system. Jim Hart said he would rather see the purchase of more, smaller buses than 5 big buses.

*****Richard Martin moved that the Policy Committee approve the request in the following priority order for the hybrid buses as a competitive application, for the fare collection equipment as a competitive application and for the facility security camera system as a competitive application through ARRA as outlined in the staff packet. Julie Thomas seconded. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.**

Mr. Hess noted that staff was notified that the BMCMPPO will receive just under \$3.1 million in stimulus funds. This funding will be like Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding. The PC will be tasked with deciding how to spend that money. Staff has been working with the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, and the town of Ellettsville on what kind of projects they would be interested in pursuing. It is federal funding and the projects have to follow federal guidelines. We will have until March 3, 2010 to obligate this funding. Staff is not confident that the list in the packet has been fine-tuned enough. Details are coming out daily. Staff suggests holding off on the recommendation of programming the \$3.1 million until a later date. Staff would like to have a special meeting on April 3 to move on the LPA suggested projects. The Committee concurred with holding a special meeting. Mr. Hess said that on March 20 there would be a meeting in Seymour with INDOT and FHWA. All LPAs are being encouraged to attend and ask questions to learn how they could use ARRA funds. Staff hopes that the project list can be refined after that. Mr. Martin said he didn't want to see projects that already have funding not proceed while waiting to see if they get ARRA funds. What happens to the money that we had planned on spending? Mr. Hess said that if federal funding is being replaced by ARRA funds, the project needs to be moving up in time. The replaced federal funds can be used for different projects. It was decided to hold a special meeting on April 3.

iv. Monroe County projects - to be discussed on April 3, 2009.

v. City of Bloomington projects - to be discussed on April 3, 2009.

vi. Town of Ellettsville - to be discussed on April 3, 2009

b. Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Grant Award – MCCSC (*Action Requested)**

Mr. Hess said the MCCSC was awarded SRTS funds and is asking for a consultant led analysis project to be amended into the TIP. This project will aid the MCCSC to draft travel plans at 6 area schools—Highland Park Elementary, University Elementary, Tri-North Middle School, Fairview Elementary, Arlington Elementary and Binford/Rogers Elementary. The award is for \$75,000. There was no public comment. ***** Susie Johnson moved approval. Frank Nierzwicki seconded. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.**

c. Highway Safety Improvement Grant Award – City of Bloomington (*Action Requested)**

Mr. Hess introduced this amendment which will allow the Atwater/Henderson intersection improvement program. The CAC, TAC and PC all agreed unanimously to award this project \$571,000 in HSIP funds. At that time, the PC did not amend the TIP to show HSIP funding for the project. There was no public comment. *****Richard Martin moved approval of the**

amendment to the TIP. Jack Baker seconded. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

d. W. 3rd Street – City of Bloomington (*Action Requested)**

Mr. Hess said this amendment would allow shifting unused federal funds from the right-of-way acquisition phase to the construction phase of the project. There was no public comment.

*****Bill Stuebe moved approval of the TIP amendment. Bill Williams seconded. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.**

e. I-69 Hardship right-of-way acquisition (1 parcel) - INDOT (*Action Requested)**

Josh Desmond indicated that INDOT is proposing to acquire property for I-69 located at 3301 W. Tapp Rd. at the southwest corner of Tapp Rd. and Hwy 37 immediately adjacent to the intersection. Any time federal funding is going to be used within the MPO's urbanized area for any phase of a road project, it needs to be published within that MPO's TIP (Transportation Improvement Program). This goes for any road projects within the city, county or Ellettsville and state highways. The property owner has filed an application with INDOT requesting that INDOT purchase the property under the Hardship Acquisition Policy. The property owner has moved out of state some time ago and has been unable to sell the property for an extended period of time. Aware of the I-69 project discussion, the property owner went to the Section 5 local office to discuss the property only to discover that about 90% of her property would be used under either design scenario if and when this project would actually go to construction. As a result, INDOT has determined this property acquisition qualifies for the Hardship Acquisition process. Now INDOT is seeking federal funds to acquire the property under the policy and include it in the TIP. This is the first time a TIP amendment has been requested for this particular project under the Hardship Policy. All of the other Hardship applications that have been undertaken with regard to the I-69 project have been outside of MPO areas. If INDOT purchases this property, they will seek to demolish the home and replant the site with grass and will maintain the site until such time as it may be needed for construction for this particular project. This project did go through the public participation process – it was publicly noticed and there was a 30 day public comment period. Twelve comments were received during the public comment period (these were distributed as a supplemental hand out to the packet). Staff presented the request to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Citizens Advisory Committee on Feb. 25. Both committees as well as staff recommended approval of the TIP amendment.

David Butts, INDOT Deputy Project Manager for I-69 for the 142 mile portion of the project from I-64 to Indianapolis, spoke about the project. As Mr. Desmond indicated this is a hardship acquisition. The person who owns the property has moved out of state in 2001. GE closed, she lost her job, moved to South Carolina to continue working for GE, lost that job in 2004 and during that entire time frame since 2001 has been trying to sell her property. She had a contract sale at one time from 2004 through 2007, was defaulted on and the property went back to her. This person qualifies very well under the Hardship policy that has been established and approved through the INDOT Real Estate section and the Federal Highway policies. To do this a person has to have financial and/or medical hardship and has tried and documented to sell their home within a typical time frame that a home of that nature will sell and the property has to be directly impacted by I-69. Approximately 90-95% of the property is indicated for use in

either alternate in consideration for I-69. Another point of consideration for this amendment is that the Record of Decision states, “The Record of Decision approves the use of federal funds for property acquisition for the project to the extent that such acquisitions meet the conditions for a hardship or protective acquisition as defined in applicable Federal Highway regulations.” INDOT is requesting the Policy Committee to amend this project into the TIP so that it is in conformance with the State’s Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

Andy Ruff asked Mr. Butts if anyone in the history of this proposed project has ever asked INDOT for a hardship buyout. Mr. Butts said to his knowledge this is the first. However there were several homes in Martinsville which were flooded last June that were purchased under hardship acquisition. Mr. Ruff asked if Mr. Butts was saying that individuals have approached INDOT that didn’t meet the criteria or that no one has ever approached INDOT about a buyout. Mr. Butts said there have been others that have approached INDOT for hardship acquisition and either they weren’t directly affected or they did not qualify on medical or financial grounds or they could not document in a sufficient manner the effort to try to sell their property. Mr. Ruff asked if we could have access to those records of those discussions with those property owners regarding their requests. Mr. Butts said that INDOT did not get involved in those other discussions. Mr. Ruff asked if those records could be accessed by the public in order to see why other hardship requests have been rejected in the past. Mr. Butts didn’t know if they would be available or not. The records would be information from a private individual to INDOT or FHWA with the decisions being made at that level. Mr. Ruff asked if this particular homeowner was required to demonstrate that any effort had been made to lease or rent the property. I-69 is not even close to being funded which is why it shouldn’t be in our Long Range Transportation Plan specific to fiscal constraint. It seems perfectly reasonable that if I-69 is far off than the opportunity for renting or leasing would be an option for someone who is not a resident owner. Mr. Butts said that personally, he couldn’t disagree with Mr. Ruff on that point but per our regulations, he didn’t think that this was a necessary aspect for them to look at. Mr. Ruff asked when the appraisals on the property were done to establish the value of the property. Mary Jo Hamman of Michael Baker said that to her knowledge the actual appraisal of the property has not been completed. What we see in the packet is an estimate. The environmental document will be processed for that individual parcel and the categorical exclusion and the appraisals will be done immediately after that. Mr. Ruff asked if the property value under a soon-to-be completed appraisal is significantly lower (due to the current economy), would the amount paid to the property owner be the amount of the appraisal or the amount at the time the owner began to try to sell the property. Ms. Hamman asked if he was talking about when the owner initially made the effort to sell the property to the general populace or with regards to their contract. Mr. Ruff said he would think it should be valued as it would have before the knowledge of the highway impacting them. Mr. Butts said that he was certain that the value from when the appraisal is accomplished (which is in the future) would be the value offered to the property owner.

Mr. Martin said that Mr. Butts had indicated that there were two components to the hardship acquisition criteria—one had to be a demonstrated economic or medical hardship and the other had to be that the property had been on the market for a typical time for the area. What is the typical time for our area? Mr. Butts said that the timeframe for this parcel has been from October 2007 to May 2008. Mr. Martin asked what was typical not how long this has been on

the market. Mr. Butts said he was not familiar with the typical time frame in Bloomington. People who are familiar with this process have done the evaluation. Mr. Martin asked if the property is vacant. Mr. Butts said yes. Ms. Hamman said that the property owner had it on contract sale between 2004 and 2007. When that sale fell through she listed it with a realtor and had been trying to sell it from October 2007 until the time that she approached the project office. When she petitioned for a hardship application, she terminated the agreement with the real estate agent. Mr. Martin asked if there had been any effort to sell it since then. Ms. Hamman said not since she petitioned INDOT. She has rented it a couple of times during which the property was damaged. Since then it has been more costly for her to try to rent it.

Mr. McDaniel asked what would happen if INDOT purchased this property and I-69 is not built, does INDOT have any more practical use for this land? Mr. Butts said that they have no other practical use for it. They would retain it as excess property. This property does limit visibility at the corner. Mr. McDaniel asked what the consequences would be to the community of Bloomington if the MPO Policy Committee (PC) decided to reject this request. Janice Osadczuk (FHWA) said that they have discussed this at FHWA and want to make sure that everyone is aware that 1.) This is a hardship acquisition (unfortunately, the right-of-way people aren't here today to explain the details), 2.) This project is in your Long Range Plan. It was approved. This is a very important corridor to the United States. With that said it is important to have an executed record of decision for the location of the corridor. It is the responsibility of the State to plan transportation for interstate transportation. It is the responsibility of the MPO to plan transportation for the MPO area. It is both parties' responsibility to mutually plan when these areas overlap. FHWA considers it very important that the MPO engage the "three C" planning process. Mr. McDaniel said she didn't answer his question. He wanted to know the consequences. Ms. Osadczuk said they would send a letter to the Council on the consequences. Mr. McDaniel asked which Council. Ms. Osadczuk said the letter would go to the Policy Committee. Mr. McDaniel asked what impact would this have on federally funded transportation projects to the community? Ms. Osadczuk said that is what the letter would explain. Mr. McDaniel asked why she wasn't going to tell us now. He wanted to know if federal funding would be pulled if the amendment isn't approved. Ms. Osadczuk said FHWA wants to see continuous cooperation through comprehensive planning. They realize that there are people that may not approve of this project but it is a part of your transportation plan. They are asking to amend it into your TIP for hardship acquisition. Any MPOs that do not comply with the Three C process jeopardizes its position. Mr. McDaniel said that Ms. Osadczuk mentioned cooperative agreements and the fact that INDOT has a responsibility for interstate transportation planning and we have the responsibility for planning in our own community. If we are being threatened with having our federal funding removed, this doesn't sound like a cooperative agreement. Ms. Osadczuk said that they are not saying, "You have to do this and you have to do that." They are saying that we have to work together to solve your problems.

Frank Nierzwicki asked INDOT and FHWA will I-69 be built if the only parcel they get in Monroe County is the parcel in question. Ms. Osadczuk said that I-69 is being built right now through Section 1. Mr. Nierzwicki asked how big is the parcel in question. Mr. Butts said it is less than .5 acres. Mr. Nierzwicki asked would this parcel be enough to build I-69. Mr. Butts said no, they would not be able to build I-69 based on this one parcel. Mr. Nierzwicki asked if INDOT has ever had excess parcels for projects that never come to fruition. Mr. Butts said he

was certain that they have. Mr. Nierzwicki said this would not be the first time that this could possibly happen. Mr. Butts said that is correct. They have a person who deals with excess land within INDOT. If it turns out that the land is not going to be used for transportation purposes, it can be sold. Mr. Nierzwicki said that if I-69 does not come in but there ever has to be a safety project at this intersection, INDOT could use this land for that type of project. Is that right? Mr. Butts said very much so. Mr. Nierzwicki said that many people have legitimate concerns about the status of this project and where it's going to go in the future but the issue that he is trying to make today is about one parcel and one person trying to sell land that they can't sell. That is the only issue that they should be looking at today. You may have your valid concerns and your legitimate issues. The issue that we have to look at is the fairness to the individual who's trying to sell their land. Maybe that person has a condition where they need to have some money especially with the downturn in the economy. Bill Stuebe said he is thinking of the homeowner who has lost his job, moved to get another job, lost his job again, has rented it with poor results. In the meantime, he's stuck and paying county taxes. He understands the big picture but we need to keep this in mind.

Mark Kruzan said that the issue is bigger than the one person who can't sell their property. It's about the hundreds of people who will be adversely impacted. Think of how different this is going to look if we empower the project to go forward. Even the strip of green that you see in the median will disappear. His concern is whether this vote will adversely impact this corridor. He appreciated the questions from Mr. McDaniel although he wasn't able to get them answered. He said he didn't envy the INDOT or FHWA peoples' jobs but he thought that the questions from the MPO could have been anticipated. It is difficult to go forward without knowing the answers to these questions. The chair asked questions that the community needs to know the answers to. Can anyone tell them how many potential hardship cases there are in the entire proposed corridor? Mr. Butts said there are approximately 50 homes in Martinsville area that were flooded. Otherwise, aside from this particular instance, he believed they had seen possibilities of multiple families in Greene County. From this day forward INDOT has no idea. Mr. Kruzan said that he assumed that it won't be a different case for any of the properties along the corridor. No one is going to want to buy their properties. Mr. Butts said that people don't seem to want to buy property along the corridor because they think the road will be coming through in 6 or 8 years. Quite frankly, this is not the case. Section 5 is not funded at this time and therefore, there is really no schedule for any activities at this time. Mr. Kruzan asked how many properties total along the proposed route have been acquired as hardship cases. Ms. Hammon said this is the first one other than the flooded houses in Martinsville. To her knowledge there has been one other formal request in Greene County and is under review. In the Section 5 office, about 6 people have come in and talked to them about it. They have been provided a copy of the policy. Mr. Kruzan asked if each case that comes up would have to be put into the MPO TIP. Mr. Butts said yes, if they qualify. Mr. Kruzan asked if they are qualified, within an MPO and not in a TIP, can the State legally move forward and purchase that property as a hardship case. If it is not in a TIP, does that mean the State will have to tell the homeowner that they are not going to acquire their property? Ms. Hammon said they can't use federal funds if local TIP and the State TIP are not in sync. Mr. Kruzan asked if in that case the State would not acquire the property or seek to acquire through other monies. Mr. Butts said that provided there are sufficient funds for that acquisition in their TIP, they would proceed forward with acquisition using State funds. Mr. Kruzan said he appreciated that answer. If we

choose not to include the hardship case that INDOT seeks within our TIP, what will be the consequences to the entire MPO or to the City? Will we have our money pulled? Ms. Osadczuk said she was given instructions to say that we have a stepped response to that. What we will be doing is asking the MPO to go along with their 3 step process. We need to make sure that both you and your MPO and INDOT are complying with federal regulations. That stepped process will probably have possible actions. Ms. Osadczuk said she didn't want to put something out without a letter and apologized for having insufficient information. Mr. Kruzan said that he knew that Ms. Osadczuk was in a tough position and that the higher-ups should provide staff will the full information before you got here. His concern was with the legal requirements. If we choose not to put something into the TIP, the TIP falls out of sync with the reality of what is happening with INDOT, is there anything in the law that says that we then don't qualify for our funding. Ms. Osadczuk said there are federal regulations which govern the relationship between State DOTs and the MPOs and how MPOs are certified (Section 450 - she thinks). Part of that certification process is the 3 C process. FHWA would be looking very strongly at whether the 3 C process is being followed. Mr. Kruzan asked the MPO staff if I-69 as proposed is part of our TIP or part of our plan. Ms. Osadczuk and staff said it is part of the plan. Mr. Kruzan asked if I-69 becomes null and void if it hasn't been amended into the TIP. We have to be in compliance and adopt this into the TIP and if not then there is a stepped process of punitive measures against us one of which could be that our TIP is no longer certified in the eye's of the federal government. Does that mean that I-69 itself is no longer officially approved because it is not in our TIP? Ms. Osadczuk said it is not in your TIP right now. It is in your transportation plan. It could end up after a certain amount of time that your TIP would be frozen. That just means you could not amend into your TIP. It doesn't mean what you've got now is no longer viable, it means that changes might not be able to occur until you came into compliance.

Mr. Ruff said that he was around the MPO at the time that the project was included in the Long Range Transportation Plan and it was under the same sort of vague threats of decertification and denial of funding that the MPO felt compelled to include I-69. It goes back to the sense of collaboration and cooperation and that the local MPO doesn't really feel empowered to be in an equal bargaining position when it comes to these types of issues. Is FHWA aware that the City of Bloomington has an official resolution and actual legislative action, signed by the mayor and approved by the Council, against I-69 laying out multiple elaborated reasons why? He asked the question because taking this action puts the PC in conflict with our official, stated City position on I-69. We are in the position of deciding whether we want to be inconsistent with the State's TIP or do we want to be inconsistent with our democratically arrived position of our community on I-69. Ms. Osadczuk said she thought she remembered that happening a few years ago. She restated it is the responsibility of the MPO to plan for your metropolitan planning area's transportation. It is the responsibility of the State to plan for areas around the state transportation in the state. Where they overlap, the regulations said that you must work together cooperatively, continuously and collaboratively. That is what we are saying that you need to show us. Mr. Ruff said so demonstrating that there has been an effort made is what you are requesting at this point. Ms. Osadczuk said they are requesting that both sides comply with the federal regulations.

Mr. Ruff noted that the Federal Transportation Act guidelines state that projects must be fiscally constrained. You must have identified funding. Ms. Osadczuk concurred. Mr. Ruff

asked how much of the I-69 overall project has specifically identified funding to construct it. Ms. Osadczyk said she believed Sections 1-3 are funded. Mr. Ruff asked for a dollar amount compared to the total project. Mr. Ruff asked what part of the project is fiscally constrained. Mr. Butts said the funding that is designated for I-69 is for Sections 1, 2 and 3 which gets up to US 231 at the northwest corner of Crane Naval Warfare Surface Center. The total amount for that currently is \$700 million. Mr. Ruff asked what year was that estimate was arrived at. Mr. Ruff also asked Mr. Butts to confirm that well over half of this project has no identified funding. Mr. Butts said that Sections 4, 5 and 6 have no identified source of funding. Mr. Ruff asked how is it that this project fiscally constrained. Do we typically see local projects come forward where 10-30% of the project does not have an identified source of funding and we are asking for money to spend on that project with no planned funding for the rest of it? How would FHWA view that sort of request for a local project? Ms. Osadczyk said that any project put into the TIP has to be fiscally constrained. Mr. Ruff asked about projects in the Long Range Transportation Plan. Ms. Osadczyk said it has to be fiscally feasible. In other words fiscally constrained means basically they have to have the money in the bank. Fiscally conceivable means they have to have within their long range plan a formulation that says they will have money for that. Mr. Ruff said yet we are asked to put this into the TIP when this segment of the project is not fiscally constrained. It doesn't belong in the TIP. I don't accept that we can look at this purchase of this property as the project. It is part of a totally unfunded section of the proposed I-69 extension. We are being asked, I think, to violate the requirement for fiscal constraint. Ms. Osadczyk said that is why they have urged its acquisition, so that if there is a problem that someone can come in to ask to be bought out as long as they qualify. Mr. Ruff said that what she was saying was that hardship only applies regardless of fiscal constraint. Even if you had a project fully funded you could have to do a hardship buyout. Ms. Osadczyk said if it was in an MPO area it would have to be in the TIP. Mr. Ruff asked if INDOT was prepared right now for an onrush of hardship buyouts all along the corridor. Mr. Butts said that anyone who wishes to make application for hardship acquisition for financial or medical reasons, as long as they qualify, INDOT is ready to look at them. Mr. Ruff said there have been multiple design changes to the road. Can we see what this section through Monroe County is going to look like right now or are going by what was in the EIS? Ms. Hamman said that right now on section 5, we have our most recently published document available on the web. You are welcome to come into the project office anytime and they will sit down and go through where they are in the process. We are currently looking at two different alternatives in this area. The options are either access at Tapp Rd. or no access at Tapp Rd. Mr. Ruff asked if they even know if there is going to be an interchange at this location. Ms. Hamman said they have to consider both alternatives when they look at hardship acquisitions. Mr. Ruff asked if there is a finalized plan through Monroe County at this time. Ms. Hammon said there is not. Mr. Ruff asked if costs of construction have been going up generally for a while. Mr. Butts said yes. He noted that some of the design changes have been a result of the increased costs of materials.

Mr. Baker thanked Mayor Krusan for bringing up this line of thought. The CAC recommended this amendment before the information discussed today was available. It probably would have affected how the CAC voted. If the PC chooses to refuse to modify our TIP and be out of sync with the State TIP, would the State defer buying this property now or put it off to some time in the future in the spirit of cooperation of working with this organization? Ms. Hamman said that if we were to defer the purchase of that property, the individual would lose the property. If

INDOT doesn't purchase this property, she will have no way to support herself during her retirement or pay her medical bills.

Ms. Johnson asked if the State could use other funds to buy the property. Mr. Butts said he would suspect that this was a possibility if funds were available. Ms. Thomas said she sympathizes with property owners who are in dire straits—not just limited to this parcel—and not just limited to I-69. Why does the MPO have to vote on it? Philosophically speaking, if they want us to vote on this project then there is a reason for it. Mr. Nierzwicki said it is because this property is in an area of the MPO. Ms. Thomas said she understood that but it does mean that we do have some authority here. Mr. Nierzwicki asked what do we need to do if we want the State to use their own money to buy the properties. Mr. Martin said it is clear that the State is interested in buying this piece of property. Which pile of money is going to be authorized to do the purchase? We can make a hardship case for this particular piece of property and therefore the pots are different. What you are asking us to do is to include the project in our TIP so that you can take it out of the I-69 hardship pot rather than the State's other land acquisition pot. Is that correct? Mr. Butts said they are asking us to allow them to use federal funding so that we can help this individual. Mr. Martin said and this is a hardship for a piece of property that has been on the market for 7 months and has associated with it some economic or medical hardship with this particular owner. Ms. Hamman clarified the amount of time the property has been on the market. Mr. Martin said he wished the State would agree to buy every piece of property in this community which has those circumstances; because there are several that he could think of off the top of his head. That is stretching the definition of "typical" amount of time on the market. It is very typical at this point in time for considerable amounts of time to pass and multiple attempts to purchase property before a property sells.

Mr. McDaniel asked for public comment and pointed out that there is a time limit per speaker. Please do not repeat what others have said. Tom Tokarski (CARR) said he wanted to stress that this MPO is responsible to all of the citizens of this community not just one person who is having the hardship. He has worked with INDOT for 18 years and he has never seen them act out of humanitarian concerns. INDOT acts out of concerns for INDOT. It sounds like the MPO is being blackmailed by INDOT if you don't act on their request. By amending the TIP to include the purchase of right-of-way for I-69, this MPO is demonstrating that it not only sees I-69 as a feasible project but it also is cooperating with INDOT to plan for I-69. This act will be forwarded by INDOT and FHWA to other state agencies and to politicians who are promoting I-69 around the state. It will be interpreted that Monroe County is finally on board with I-69. Amending the TIP in this way will be used to negate the resolution opposing the construction of I-69 through the City of Bloomington's Common Council. It will likely be used to lock in I-69 through this corridor and to help forward the corridor project. If you amend the TIP, you will be ignoring the wishes of thousands of citizens of Bloomington and Monroe County. You will not know what kind of highway you will be supporting by this action. Through the huge cost increases for all highway construction, INDOT has now drastically changed the design for I-69 in Daviess, Pike, Gibson and Greene counties. Interchanges have either been moved or deferred. Right-of-way parameters are changing, bridges have been shortened and instead of concrete they are going to use asphalt. He has been told by one of the consultants for section 4 that it has been redesigned. We do not know what the implications or impacts will be for Monroe County. This will be a different project than what was presented in the Tier 1 filing in

2003. Relative to that INDOT has recently denied public and local officials access to data collected to assist the environmental and other impacts of I-69. The estimated cost of the total project is now estimated to be \$4 ½ to \$5 billion. There is no way that the I-69 project is fiscally constrained as required by this project. Indeed, this MPO should undertake action to remove I-69 from the Long Range Transportation Plan. He pointed out that the Transportation Plan's Vision Statement on page 5 of the Long Range Plan states many conditions for projects to be included in the Long Range Plan. I-69 violates practically every one of these statements. In the world we live in and in looking forward to the future of transportation, I-69 makes no sense at all. He asked for a show of agreement from the audience and many people clapped.

Donna Lentz Ferree said that she had been a student in the Leadership Bloomington program. She is sorry for the property owner. She owns 40 acres that she can't sell either. Even if she drops the price, no one will buy it. She has medical and financial hardships, too, like everybody else. It bothers her that they want to support one person and they are already out of state and they only have ½ an acre. Why don't they just donate it to Sycamore Land Trust. They should try to sell it off to promote something that most citizens don't even want in the first place. She wanted to say to the people who support I-69 that every time they look at satellite maps and you see landscape along the route, she wanted them to understand that there are people that live on those little squares. She is one of them. She and her husband have worked hard to try to take care of a little plot of land to call their own and to have for their family. A lot of people here are her neighbors. I-69 will devastate this part of Monroe County. She hoped that her fellow citizens would understand that this isn't just a political thing or something that NAFTA needs for their purposes, this is part of our community and she's willing to fight very hard to save it. She will do whatever she can to stop it. This is her country, too. Her family has been here since 1828.

Jess Gwinn said that if INDOT gets this one property, the door is now cracked open. There is no way that you are going to put the genie back in the bottle. I-69 would now be a permanent part of the Bloomington landscape. The majority of people in Bloomington, Monroe and the surrounding communities do not want I-69. He asked the PC to not include this parcel into the TIP. With I-69 being part of the Long Range Plan and then the MPO, this will be hanging over our heads forever. It needs to be removed from the MPO.

Lucille Bertuccio said it is rather ironic that a woman destroyed by NAFTA is now begging the NAFTA highway to buy her property. She feels sorry for her as she feels sorry for most people in that position. But that is how we have been used by the powers that be. We need to transition from an addiction to fossil fuels. By doing that does not mean that we need more highways. What we need is transportation in and out of our communities and not in a 4-wheeled vehicle that we drive individually but in ways that we can get from place to place. It took her 18 ½ hours to get from Indianapolis to Bloomington because she got to Indianapolis in the middle of the night on a train. She couldn't get out of Indianapolis until the next morning. That is a shame. We are supporting a road that makes people get in their cars and drive using whatever fuel they may use. Electric is bad, fossil fuels are terrible, and so are biofuels. They are all bad. What we need to be concentrating on is a route from here to Indianapolis to Chicago in a way that people who don't have cars and shouldn't have cars can get there. She is totally against this

road. Providing for this one family may be good-hearted but is not in the best interest of the community.

Jaime Sweany who owns Wandering Turtle Art Gallery in downtown Bloomington said that she felt sorry for this property owner that her hardship is actually caused by I-69. The loss of manufacturing is only being facilitated by the highways and projects like I-69 which made it easier for our jobs to go south. It took her 1 ½ years to sell her beautiful home on the north side of Bloomington during great economic times near Lake Griffy and it never even occurred to her that she might petition for a hardship acquisition. Lots of people are having a hard time selling their homes and a lot of people are losing their homes due to medical bankruptcy and issues like that. This person is not alone. She doesn't think INDOT should buy her property. She was shocked that the PC was put into the position to vote on this now with information being withheld from you until you receive a letter sometime in the future. She finds that unconscionable. She is downtown business owner who has just received the downtown business of the year award. As a 30-year resident, business owner and someone who cares deeply about Bloomington, she is unequivocally and adamantly opposed to I-69. She doesn't agree with the people who think that it will be good for business. Bloomington values its historic downtown and our locally owned, eclectic shops and restaurants. I-69 will in no way enhance our city. It would not only wreak havoc on our environment but will literally divide us. She can say that as a west side resident whose property is not very far from that parcel. She would personally not want to live on the other side of this highway. It would also encourage more non-locally owned big box stores and chain restaurants to appear adding further competition in an already competitive and difficult environment for locally owned businesses. It would detract aesthetically and create an "Anywhere, USA" feel upon this corridor. She feels strongly that I-69 is a threat to our way of life. Even if it would create increased traffic of visitors who want to blow in and out of our city, it would not enhance our community spirit. No parcel of Bloomington property should be allowed to fall into this project's hands or make it easier for INDOT to push this unwanted highway onto our community. Bloomington does not want this highway and does not want to live with the consequences of what will happen if it does go through.

Steve Hendricks of Highland Village thanked the PC for serving and dealing with all these issues and minutiae. He is not necessarily anti-car. We live in a country with such a unique blessing where people have had freedom and the ability to influence policy and decision making. We are rapidly getting to the place—originally the government was a facilitator and defining policy had limitations. We are getting away from all these things. The interstate project that we are talking about is a major example of how we are losing the unique situation that we have had in America. The committee may or may not affect the highway project or be able to restore the circumstances that we have up to now enjoyed as Americans. However, he urged the committee regardless of what you do with this particular decision—he urged the committee and everyone here not to disappear our will regarding what is right, what is responsible and what is common sense.

Brian Garvey, a 35-year resident of southwestern Monroe County completely disagrees that this is about a private property owner and not much more. This represents the micro/macro of the I-69 initiative. It is evident to him that certainly INDOT is using this as an opportunity to

get it into the TIP and into the MPO general planning. INDOT has shown over the years how they think about people, places and things. They have a job to do and bosses to answer to and Mitch Daniels has his bosses to answer to, too. They will use the hardship acquisition policy to legitimize this project. What was a bad idea is becoming an insane idea. I-69 is a dinosaur that should be allowed to die but there's momentum and powerful people behind it. There is the issue of this little house on the corner. He has known farmers and people out where he lives that have been on hold for 20 years because of this thing. There was a farmer in Greene County who committed suicide when he saw he was on the map. There has been hardship for years and he wasn't making light of it in any way. It is completely disingenuous for INDOT claim that they want to help this person. They want to extend it and put it on the TIP and it's plain. How many times did we hear "conforming?" The job of this body is to conform to the will of the people who elected them. The democratic process has broken down in the case of I-69. When asked, 94% of the people in this state said they didn't want I-69--over 130,000 responded. It was unprecedented. This is a fantastic opportunity for the MPO to look at it for what it truly is. This is how these dinosaurs continue in increments. It is not based in the reality of a 10-30 year realistic fiscally responsible transportation plan. It shouldn't be on the radar and other states have known this. Other states have said they are going to take the billions of dollars that this would require and think about light rail. Pain makes changes. This is a great opportunity to change course before we break our legs and arms with this I-69 business. He hopes they take advantage of this opportunity.

Jim Hart thanked the PC for all of the time they devote to the minutiae. The City's representatives in the form of the Mayor and the Common Council have expressed a more deep widespread expression of the general will of the City of Bloomington. Regardless of the minutiae of fiscal constraints, there is the issue of moral constraints. We've been at this for almost a generation. He urged them to meditate on that. There is something of disingenuousness of this issue of hardship. This project has caused a great deal of hardship. There is going to be a mess made in Daviess County. This concern for hardship by INDOT is something of a revelation but frankly he's very suspicious.

Shodo Spring said she greatly appreciated the questions that were asked by members of this group and she wanted to appreciate the fortitude of those answering those questions which poked to pieces their arguments. She learned that the State of Indiana could help out this woman if they want to. This group all by itself can stop the progress of I-69. She would like to proceed to address that and that there will be some fairly severe consequences. A Pennsylvania township decided that it did not want to be a dump site for one of those giant waste firms. They passed an ordinance prohibiting it. They had a huge fight. They won and they have become the inspiration for communities and individuals throughout the country. You all can stand up and say that we will not be tricked or pressured. We will do what is good for our community and what is good for the environment, the nation and the world—none of which includes I-69. Not only would we be noticed but supported. She asked the PC to stand up to them.

Jan Henderson sells real estate. She wanted to know if the property owner has any equity in this property at all. There was an allusion to the fact that she would lose this property if INDOT would not buy her out. That implies that there is a mortgage on the property. That is all the more reason that she feels that we are being coerced. Entities coerce and humans have the

capacity to cooperate. We are seeing a collision between entities and real humans. Anyone here who wants to oppose putting this in the TIP is kind of pleading as people. We are not wishing any ill to some other human who is having a hard time but we don't want to be coerced by an entity. She loves that she is America and how patient and civil everyone in this room is being. She has had hundreds of calls from people regarding properties and she has never had a single person inquire if Bloomington had an interstate. The whole idea that having an interstate is going to enhance the economic position of Bloomington is completely false. Any supposed proof of this must come from entities instead of people.

Lily Kleinlein said that she has had a house on the market for about 7 months. As excruciating as that is, she's been told that's normal and it could be a whole lot worse. As a citizen of Monroe County, Indiana and the United States, she expects all of you to fight for us and for our causes. We elected you to these positions because we trust in your judgment. As a citizen, she doesn't appreciate the blatant bullying from State officials and higher-up employees. I know that they are probably being bullied by their own employees but she noted that we are trying to teach our kids not to bully but here they are seeing grown-ups bullying each other, it's really hard to see. She was appalled by the idea that those people against I-69 are against America. We are all citizens and maybe they have a different view of what is best for this country but the reason that we are all sitting here is that we care very much about America and their ideals about what kind of future we hope for our children and for ourselves. Thanks to the people representing us and please continue to do so.

Sura Gail Tala said that her main business is in real estate and she lives nowhere near I-69. She lives in the northeastern corner of the county. In her area, property is on the market for about 2 or 3 years. In the rental business, it is very typical for rentals to wreck your property. You hire a management company to overlook your property. She sees no hardship here but instead setting a precedent toward being in support of I-69. She has been to I-69 gatherings like this for 17 years. Her son dedicated 2 years to working on this issue. She feels strongly about animals and how they will lose their homes and be killed. This has got to be opposed. We have got to stop it. There is a huge group of people including the mayor who oppose I-69. She hopes that all of you will listen to the comments here and realize all the lives that you are affecting.

Dave Bush, a 20-year resident of Monroe County, thanked the PC for listening to them. He was born and raised in the Pike Township area of Indianapolis. Before I-465 was built, he rode his bike to school and learned to drive on the back roads of that part of the county. After I-465 was built, the township was cut in half. What used to be nice residential areas and farm land became industrial tracts and commercial development to the point where it is ruined. You would have trouble finding a place to put a spade in the ground now. What started out as a 6 lane interstate has warped into a 12 lane monster with concrete barriers on each side. One of the reasons he moved to Monroe County was because he valued the quality of life, pace and feeling of community here. When they lay I-69 over SR 37, they will cut the community in half. Things will not be the same. The building and development that will come with it will bring a whole host of issues that he doesn't value. He drives to Indianapolis about 3 days a week for business and goes up SR37. He cannot believe the extra 10,000 vehicles a day that I-69 will bring is going to solve any traffic flow issue. It's going to exacerbate an already bad situation. He still can't come to grips with why our leaders at the state level didn't choose the I-70/US 41 route

which would have been a much better selection when you look at the value of property and the value of pristine lands and communities. You could have saved yourselves a billion dollars and have improved those roads rather than trying to push this thing through cross country. He thought it was unfortunate that INDOT and FHWA didn't think enough of Bloomington and Monroe County to send individuals here who were not at the level that they could speak to the questions that were asked here today. He implored the PC to continue to fight the good fight, do the things you think are right in your hearts—it's not too late. The citizens were able to stop Marble Hill Nuclear Power Plant. He looks forward to celebrating with his children and grandchildren that we don't have an interstate coming up the center of Monroe County.

Jeffrey Huntsman, a 39-year resident of Monroe County, loves living in the woods. He grew up in rural Maine in a town that makes Harrodsburg look like LA. The majority of their roads were dirt. He drove most of the way across country on Route 66. He's driven on many roads that don't even have names. He restores automobiles. He appreciates good interstate roads when he travels long distances. With all that said, the new terrain I-69 is a disaster. It is an idiocy. When it's completed, under the best estimates, it will decrease travel time by 15 minutes. He urged the PC to pay attention to what the people including the mayor have said and compare that to the underwhelming testimony by the officials. It will cost too much and be outdated in 20 years. He felt sorry for the particular property owner. But, it has been admitted somewhat reluctantly that if the State wants to, it will buy it.

Charlie Savage thanked everyone for a great meeting. INDOT and Gov. Daniels caused this situation and now they want us feel guilty. He asked the PC to vote no.

Mr. McDaniel thanked the public for their comments. He asked for final committee comments and a vote on the motion. Mr. Martin said to the FHWA representative that the decision that is made here is not about whether or not this property gets purchased. That is immaterial here because the State has the opportunity to purchase it at this time. It is just a matter of which pot of money it is going to come from—whether it's going to be State only funds or federal funds. He wanted to make it clear that should they choose not to put this in the TIP, this is not necessarily a repudiation of our existing transportation plan. It is entirely consistent that we would say, "Federal money should not be used for this—state money should be used for this." That is essentially the decision that we are being asked to make. He wanted to make it clear that this is not to say that we are kicking I-69 out of here and nobody wants to do it ever. This is simply choosing which pot of money to use. We can make that decision independent of all the other arguments. That is the decision that we have to make tonight. Ms. Osadcuk said she would take that information back to FHWA.

Mr. Ruff recognized the State and Federal staff that is here. They have been professional and done their jobs well. He thanked the public for waiting 2 or 3 hours and have contributed tremendously to this discussion. He thanked the MPO staff and colleagues. It has been a great show of democracy. INDOT doesn't have to do this. If they want to buy this property, they can buy it. By approving this, we would be helping to enable the project and we shouldn't do it. The State can buy the property. They shouldn't come here and coerce the community into sort of a back-handed endorsement of the project by unnecessarily bringing it to the MPO for a vote under duress suggesting we may be found uncooperative or jeopardizing the status of our MPO

or our federal funds. He resents disingenuously presenting this action as an act of sympathy for an unfortunate property owner. It places us, the MPO, in the false position of being unsympathetic if we don't support it. He rejects that outright. It's unfair. It is unfortunate for the property owners as with hundreds of others along the route. They do have an alternative to rent or lease since a renter isn't going to care whether in 5 years we may see I-69. A property management firm could be used. In general, he would say, not a penny for a massive project that is built with oil, that runs on oil and will be maintained by oil at a time when we are fighting wars over oil and when oil is in decline and we are not going to find a non-environmentally destructive alternative to keep massive semi-trucks rolling by the thousands around the country on expressways like this one. Not a penny for this project. Identified funding for this project doesn't even exist. It is terrible public policy to spend money on a project that is nowhere near funded. The action that needs to be taken that will assist all of the property owners along the entire route is for INDOT to drop this wrong-headed, backward, horribly wasteful and destructive project. It will help everybody and it will help the planet. Whether or not voting this TIP amendment down today seriously impedes the project of I-69 isn't really the point. We have an opportunity to take a stand. He implores his fellow PC members to vote no on this TIP amendment.

Mr. Nierzwicki said that he doesn't think that I-69 will be built through Monroe County. There was an interstate in New Jersey that stopped at an Indian reservation for a number of years. Monroe County is going to be the Indian reservation for INDOT for a number of years. That is fine if that is what this community wants. He didn't think the funding would be there. He knows how many parcels that will have to be bought and it's quite a few. INDOT will not want to come back here every time they have one parcel to buy. He feels we should be thinking about the people who own that piece of property. There are some people morally opposed to I-69. There are some people that would take the money and run. He will vote yes in support of the one person. *****Frank Nierzwicki made the motion that Policy Committee accept the request by INDOT to use federal funds to buy the parcel along SR 37. Jim Ude seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken.**

-Mr. Baker said he came in thinking he would support the motion since it was a case of hardship. Other information has come to light that has caused him to rethink the previous decision of the CAC. If it were a SR 37 hardship acquisition, we would have been out of here 2 or 3 hours ago. However, when you connect it to I-69, it brings up other issues but that would cause us to go into non-compliance with the State. He thinks he heard at this meeting that it may not be as straightforward as he and his committee were lead to believe. Not that anyone was trying to fool them - it just wasn't clear. If we go into non-compliance, there may be some options that could be taken. With the idea that those options could be taken, he is going to vote no.

-Bill Williams voted yes because he felt that the parcel could be used for to upgrade the intersection whether or not I-69 is built.

The motion was defeated by a vote by a vote of 3:9.

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

A. Topic Suggestions for future agendas

Mr. Martin said he would like to bring up another issue dealing with I-69. At the next meeting, he would like a discussion about the proposed interchange location for the north side of

Bloomington and whether it should be at old SR37 or Kinser Pike. He would like the PC to discuss this so that the City and the County can make a unified statement to the State of Indiana concerning that particular intersection. Secondly, he would like to go back to the FHWA statement about cooperating, collaborating and coordinating. The County has taken advantage of some funding to do some planning with respect to I-69. A firm has been hired to do some specific examination of proposals for us. They have reported to us that they were denied access to the information that they requested concerning I-69. Subsequent to that we have written a letter to Michael Reed, the commissioner, requesting that information. The state statute clearly states that County Plan Commissions undertaking the preparation of a comprehensive plan may request any public and private officials to make available any information, documents and plans, etc. He offered a copy of the letter to FHWA. We on the Plan Commission are trying very hard to understand what the transportation system might look like under various scenarios and determine how we might go forward with the modification of the Monroe County Thoroughfare Plan as a result of that. Without this kind of information it is not possible for us to do that activity. I respectfully request of you particularly the Section 5 project leader to be forthcoming with all and any information as soon as possible. We need the information now. Our consultants should be granted access to that information. Our Plan Commission will be following up. We don't want to be told, "no."

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- A. Technical Advisory Committee – March 25, 2009 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)**
- B. Citizens Advisory Committee – March 25, 2009 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)**
- C. Policy Committee – Special Meeting to discuss Stimulus projects - April 3, 2009 at 1:30pm (McCloskey Room)**

Adjournment

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

*These minutes were adopted by the Policy Committee at their regular meeting held on. May 8, 2009.
(RCH 5/8/09)*